

# A GENERAL HISTORY OF EUROPE

350-1900

BY OLIVER J. THATCHER, PH.D.

AND FERDINAND SCHWILL, PH.D.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

EDITED AND ADAPTED FOR USE IN BRITISH UNIVERSITIES AND  
SCHOOLS, BY ARTHUR HASSALL, M.A., CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

WITH MAPS AND GENEALOGICAL TABLES

LONDON  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET  
1919

## EDITORIAL NOTE

IN revising the 'General History of Europe, I have been careful not to interfere with the plan of the book, or with the narrative. But the spelling of many words required alteration, in order to adapt the work to English readers, certain omissions have been remedied, and some errors in detail corrected. The lists of authorities have also been revised and enlarged. It is impossible for me to thank Mr G. W. Prothero adequately for his assistance in the work of revision, and more especially in preparing the Bibliography. Its excellence is entirely due to the immense amount of trouble which he took in drawing up the lists of books. I venture to think that in its present corrected form the "General History of Europe" will be found to present the best existing sketch of Medieval and Modern European history.

  
ARTHUR HASSALL.

27/1/51





## P R E F A C E

THE authors of this General History of Europe venture to hope that their book will explain itself. The only matter concerning which they feel obliged to state their position in a prefatory word is the important point of the correlation of text-book and literature. They firmly believe that the use of any single and unaided text—a practice still common in our schools—is a misfortune and a calamity, and for that reason they desire to put themselves on record in the most definite terms against that ancient abuse. Their text consequently is conceived by them as a mere framework which the literature accompanying each chapter is intended to clothe and elaborate. This literature the authors have carefully selected with the needs of the beginner in their minds, they do not wish to weary and confuse him with a great mass of material, they desire merely to conduct him a stage or two upon the path of historical studies, but they are eager that that path should be the right path. The teacher is therefore very earnestly enjoined to encourage in the pupil wide reading, and the habit of comparison and criticism. A glance over the literature of any chapter will show that the more general or accessible books come first in order; then follow more special treatises and occasional original sources. From these various kinds of literature the teacher must make his selection for the class in accordance with his view of the individual pupil's needs and powers. The authors presume to suggest in this

connection that the most effective means of applying the method of study which they have outlined is by establishing a small working library in conjunction with every class-room. It will be a great day for education when every important school is thus equipped with an historical library.

The authors wish also to call particular attention to the numerous maps and chronological and genealogical tables at the end of the book. The constant use of these by the pupils in both the preparation and the recitation of the lesson cannot be too strenuously insisted on.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

May 1, 1900

# CONTENTS

---

## PART I

### THE MEDIEVAL PERIOD

CHAP	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
I THE EMPIRE, THE CHURCH, AND THE INVASIONS OF THE GERMANS	15
II THE REACTION OF THE EMPIRE AGAINST THE GERMANS	31
III. THE FRANKS (481-814) . . . . .	39
IV. THE DISMEMBERMENT OF THE EMPIRE . . . . .	55
V ENGLAND AND THE NORSEMEN (802-1070)	62
VI. POLITICAL HISTORY OF FRANCE (887-1108)	76
VII. GERMANY AND ITS RELATION TO ITALY (887-1056)	83
VIII. FEUDALISM . . . . .	97
IX. THE GROWTH OF THE PAPACY	111
X. THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE (1056-1254) . . . . .	121
XI MONASTICISM . . . . .	156

CHAP	PAGE
XII MOHAMMED, MOHAMMEDANISM, AND THE CRUSADES . . . . .	165
XIII. THE GROWTH OF THE CITIES . . . . .	190
XIV ITALY TO THE INVASION OF CHARLES VIII (1494) . . . . .	198
XV FRANCE (1108-1494); ENGLAND (1070-1485)	204
XVI GERMANY (1254-1500) AND THE SMALLER STATES OF EUROPE . . . . .	227
XVII. RELIGIOUS AND INTELLECTUAL TENDENCIES IN THE RENAISSANCE . . . . .	238

## PART II

### THE MODERN PERIOD

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	257
XVIII ✓ THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY TO THE PEACE OF AUGSBURG (1555) . . . . .	277
XIX ✓ THE PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION IN EUROPE AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH . . . . .	289
XX ✓ SPAIN UNDER CHARLES I. (1516-56), KNOWN AS EMPEROR CHARLES V, AND PHILIP II (1556-98); HER WORLD EMINENCE AND HER DECAY. . . . .	297
XXI ✓ ENGLAND UNDER THE TUDORS (1485-1603), FINAL TRIUMPH OF THE REFORMATION UNDER ELIZABETH (1559-1603) . . . . .	303
XXII ✓ THE REVOLT OF THE NETHERLANDS AND THE TRIUMPH OF THE SEVEN UNITED PROVINCES (1566-1648) . . . . .	325

XXIII THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE TO THE RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENTS OF 1598 (EDICT OF NANTES) AND 1629	337
XXIV. THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR AND THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA	351
XXV. ENGLAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY—THE STUARTS, THE PURITAN REVOLUTION, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL MON- ARCHY UNDER WILLIAM III	366
XXVI. THE ASCENDANCY OF FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIV (1643-1715)	393
XXVII THE RISE OF RUSSIA UNDER PETER THE GREAT (1689-1725) AND CATHARINE THE GREAT (1762- 96); THE DECAY OF SWEDEN	404
XXVIII THE RISE OF PRUSSIA IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES	415
XXIX. ENGLAND AND FRANCE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CEN- TURY	428
XXX THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND ERA OF NAPOLEON (1789-1815)	441
XXXI. THE HOLY ALLIANCE AND THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1830	489
XXXII THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1848	502
XXXIII FRANCE UNDER NAPOLEON III — THE UNIFICA- TION OF ITALY	517
XXXIV THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY	523
XXXV. GREAT BRITAIN AND RUSSIA	531
XXXVI THE GENERAL SITUATION AT THE CLOSE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	542

## CHRONOLOGICAL AND GENEALOGICAL TABLES

	PAGE
I. EMPERORS AND POPES . . . . .	553
II. THE FRANKS . . . . .	557
1. THE MEROVINGIAN KINGS TO DAGOBERT I. . . . .	557
2. THE DUKES OF AUSTRASIA (ANCESTORS OF KARL THE GREAT). . . . .	557
III THE EMPIRE . . . . .	558
1. THE CAROLINGIAN HOUSE (THE KARLINGS) . . . . .	558
2. THE SAXON, FRANCONIAN, AND HOHEN- STAUFEN HOUSES; THE WELFS . . . . .	559
3. THE HOUSES OF HAPSBURG AND HAPSBURG- LORRAINE (AUSTRIA AND SPAIN) . . . . .	560
IV. FRANCE . . . . .	561
1. LATER CAROLINGIANS AND FIRST CAPETIANS (ROBERTINES), SHOWING THEIR CONNEC- TION AND RIVALRY . . . . .	561
2. THE CAPETIANS AND COLLATERAL BRANCHES . . . . .	562
3 THE HOUSES OF BOURBON AND BOURBON- ORLÉANS . . . . .	563
4. THE HOUSE OF BONAPARTE . . . . .	563
V. SPAIN. THE SPANISH BOURBONS . . . . .	564
VI. PRUSSIA. THE HOUSE OF HOHENZOLLERN . . . . .	564
VII. SWEDEN THE HOUSES OF VASA AND VASA-PFALZ- ZWEIBRUCKEN . . . . .	565

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, ETC (*continued*)—

	PAGE
VIII THE DUTCH NETHERLANDS THE HOUSE OF ORANGE-NASSAU	565
IX. RUSSIA THE HOUSES OF ROMANOFF AND ROMAN- OFF-HOLSTEIN-GOTTORP . . . . .	566
X. ENGLAND . . . . .	566
1 THE SAXON KINGS OF ENGLAND . . . . .	566
2. FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO HENRY VII . . . . .	567
3. THE HOUSES OF TUDOR, STUART, AND HANOVER, SHOWING THEIR CONNECTION . . . . .	568
INDEX . . . . .	569



## MAPS

*[At end of Volume.]*

1. EUROPE, 350 A.D., SHOWING THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND BARBARIANS.
- 2 THE GERMANIC KINGDOMS ESTABLISHED ON ROMAN SOIL.
3. KINGDOM OF THE MEROVINGIANS, SHOWING THEIR CONQUESTS.
- 4 THE EMPIRE OF KARL THE GREAT, SHOWING THE DIVISION OF 843
- 5 THE EMPIRE IN THE TIME OF OTTO THE GREAT.
- 6 ENGLAND, 878.
7. THE CRUSADES.
8. FRANCE, 1185.
9. FRANCE, 1360
10. EUROPE DURING THE REFORMATION
11. THE NETHERLANDS AT THE TRUCE OF 1609
- 12 GERMANY AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR
- 13 ENGLAND AND WALES—JANUARY 1, 1643.
- 14 WESTERN EUROPE, SHOWING THE PRINCIPAL CHANGES EFFECTED BY THE TREATIES OF UTRECHT AND RASTADT, 1713-14
15. EUROPE ILLUSTRATING WARS OF CHARLES XII AND PETER THE GREAT.
- 16 EUROPE AT THE TIME OF THE GREATEST EXPANSION OF NAPOLEON'S POWER, 1812
- 17 EUROPE AFTER THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA.
- 18 THE BALKAN PENINSULA IN THE YEAR 1881

# THE MEDIEVAL PERIOD

---

## INTRODUCTION

### LITERATURE—Tacitus, *Germania*

Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*.

Capes, *The Early Empire*.

Bury, *The Roman Empire*

Kingsley, *The Roman and the Teuton*.

Scarth, *Roman Britain*.

Fisher, *Beginnings of Christianity*.

Bury, *The Later Roman Empire*

Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

THE whole course of history is very conveniently divided into three periods—the Ancient, the Medieval, and the Modern. Generally, fixed dates have been assigned for the beginning and end of each of these. They have then been further divided and subdivided, and each division has received a particular name. While this has been more or less convenient and justifiable, the divisions have often been treated so mechanically as to make a totally wrong impression, especially on the minds of students who are just beginning the study; for if there is anything that is firmly held by all good historians to-day, it is the continuity of history. There are no real breaks in its course. Every age is a preparation for, and an introduction to, the next. One period grows into another so gradually and naturally that the people who live in the time of transition are often unconscious of the fact that a new period is beginning. Certain events may well be said to be epoch-making, but in spite of that, their full effect is not felt at once. They slowly modify the existing order of things,

gradually displacing the old by the new The world is never actually revolutionized in a day.

However, it is not wrong to separate history into such periods, for different interests prevail at different times, and, therefore, one period may have a very different character from that of another. But in making all such divisions two things ought to be carefully guarded against: fixed boundaries should not be assigned to them, and they should not be treated as if their predominant interest were their only interest. No one interest can absorb the whole life of a period. For several centuries the life of Europe has been too complex to admit of its being adequately treated from only one point of view.

The terms "Medieval" and "Middle Age" have been used because of their convenience. The invasions of the barbarians which began on a grand scale in the fourth century brought about the great change which was the beginning of the Middle Age. Its end is not perhaps so easily determined, but the period from 1450 to 1550 is marked by such movements as the great religious revolution, which involved all western Europe and was productive of many changes, the growth of absolutism in Europe, the changes in the practical government of many of the countries, the birth of political science, the multiplication of international relations, and the extension of industry and commerce, so that we may safely say that the Middle Age should end somewhere about that time. At any rate a convenient place may there be found where one may stop and mark the failing of old, and the appearance of new, tendencies and characteristics.

A comparison of the map of Europe in the fourth century of our era with that of the same country in the sixteenth century<sup>1</sup> will give the best idea of the changes that took place there during the Middle Age. Such a comparison would suggest that all

<sup>1</sup> The changes will become still more apparent if a map of Europe in the nineteenth century be used in the comparison indicated.

these changes could be grouped under four heads, namely those in the political system, in language, in religion, and in civilization

The first map shows but two grand divisions the Roman empire and the barbarians. On the second, the barbarians have almost disappeared, and the empire, while it has a nominal existence, is not at all what it was. In its stead and in the place of the barbarians, there are many separate and independent states and different nations. One asks instinctively. What has become of the empire? Where are the barbarians? How did these new states arise? What is the origin of these new nationalities?

*Entire  
changes,  
questions  
suggested  
thereby*

The linguistic changes suggested by the maps are quite as striking. Latin and Greek were the only languages in existence in Europe in the earlier time. The rude dialects of the barbarians were not regarded as languages, and were unfit for literary purposes. In the sixteenth century Greek was spoken in a limited territory, and Latin had become the language of the educated only, while the barbarian tongues had developed into literary languages.

Religiously, the changes are sweeping. At the beginning of the fourth century Europe was still prevailingly heathen. Christianity was widely spread, but its adherents were largely in the minority. In the sixteenth century, however, heathenism was nominally, at least, almost destroyed in Europe. In its stead there was Christianity in two great types. the Roman Catholic and the Greek, while a third new type, to be known as Protestantism, was about to be produced. Besides Christianity we find a part of Europe under the domination of Mohammedanism. How were the barbarians of Europe Christianized, we ask? How were the different types of Christianity produced? What separated the Greek from the Latin Church? What was the origin of Mohammedanism? What are its tenets and character? How did it spread, and what has been its history? What influence has it had on Europe? And what have been the relations between Christianity and Mohammedanism?

The changes in civilization were also radical. Civilization had passed far beyond the Rhine and the Danube, and there were already indications that its centre was soon to be changed from the south to the north. Italy, Spain, and southern France were still in advance in the sixteenth century, but England, northern France, and Germany were showing the characteristics which should eventually enable them to assume the leadership in art, science, literature, manufactures, and in nearly all that goes to make up the highest and best civilization. Here, too, questions arise. What did the rest of Europe receive from Greece and Rome? How was this inheritance transmitted? How has it been increased and modified? How were the barbarians influenced by the art, literature, architecture, law, customs, modes of thought, and life of the Greeks and Romans? What new ideas and fresh impulses have been given by the various barbarian peoples that have successively been brought in as factors in the progress and development of Europe?

The Middle Age is the birth period of the modern states of Europe. We shall study the successive periods of decay and revival in the empire; its ineffectual efforts to carry on the work of Rome in destroying the sense of difference in race, and to make all Europe one people, and its bitter struggle with its new rival, the papacy, which ended practically in the ruin of both. We shall follow the barbarians in their migrations and invasions, and watch them as they form new states and slowly learn of Rome the elements of civilization. We shall see them come to national self-consciousness, exhibiting all the signs of a proud national sense, gradually but stubbornly resisting the interference of both emperor and pope in their affairs, and finally, throwing off all allegiance to both, becoming fully independent and acknowledging their responsibility to no power outside of themselves. Along with this national differentiation goes the development of the barbarian dialects into vigorous languages, each characteristic of the people to which it belongs.

*General  
mention of  
important  
topics.*

*Empire  
Papacy.*

*Nations and  
states*

We shall study the spread of Christianity, its ideals and its two most important institutions, monasticism and papacy. The monks of the west played a most important part in Christianizing and civilizing the peoples of Europe, and the bishops of Rome came to look upon themselves as the successors, not only of Peter, but also of Cæsars, *The Church* claiming all power, both spiritual and temporal. The Church occupies, therefore, a prominent place in the history of the Middle Age.

Mohammedanism was for some time a formidable opponent of Christianity even in Europe. It set for itself the task of conquering the world. It made many determined *Mohammedanism.* efforts to establish itself firmly in Europe. The eastern question was an old one, even in the Middle Age, and the invasions of the Mohammedians into Europe and the counter-invasions of the Christians (the crusades) are all so many episodes in its history.

By invading and settling in the empire the barbarians came under the schooling of the Romans. They destroyed much, but they also learned much. The elements of the *Progress in* Græco-Roman civilization were preserved, its art, *civilization.* laws, and ideas were slowly adopted and modified by the invading peoples. We shall see how this rich legacy was preserved and gradually made the property of all the peoples of Europe, and we shall study the progress which they have made in civilization.

These are some of the problems with which the history of the Middle Age is concerned, they will be treated in their appropriate places. We shall first take a kind of inventory of the factors involved, and these are *1. Europe.* Europe (the land itself in its physical and climatic features) and in peoples.

The general contour of Europe has greatly influenced its history. It is, therefore, necessary to study its mountain systems, its plains, its coast and river systems, and its climate.

On the east, and coinciding in general with the boundary

between Asia and Europe, are the Ural Mountains. They, with the Caucasus range between the Black and Caspian Seas, form a barrier to easy communication between the east and the west, and so have forced travel and commerce, as well as invading peoples and armies, to follow certain well defined routes. The Alps and the Pyrenees have served much the same purpose in the south. They have prevented the fusion of the peoples to the north with those to the south, and have made futile all the many attempts to bring and keep them under one government. They have played important parts in the differentiation, spread, and development of the various nations about them. Their passes being few and difficult, they have hindered intercourse and have prevented interference, and so each people has been left more exclusively to itself to work out its own character and destiny. Even in the small physical divisions of Europe, mountains have done much to isolate and divide those whom everything else has sought to fuse and unite. They have helped to perpetuate tribal and racial differences in Scandinavia, in Germany, in Austria, and especially in the Balkan peninsula, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. There can be no doubt that the mountains of these countries still make the problems of their respective governments more difficult. They have been constant and efficient barriers to the formation of extensive states and governments in western Europe.

On the other hand, the great central plains offer every opportunity for the homogeneous development of their inhabitants and for the formation of governments with extensive sway. Being adapted to the occupation of grazing, agriculture, and similar pursuits, they determined the earliest occupations of the people. So long as the number of their inhabitants was small, the great extent of their areas favoured the continued separation of the nomadic tribes that wandered over them; and with increasing population the peoples were more easily brought together and subjected to the influence of the same ideas, whether political, social, or religious.

Turning to the study of its coast we note that Europe itself

is essentially a peninsula, and is besides deeply indented by arms of the sea, so that it has a large extent of coast line. Its two great inland seas offer, because of their calmness, excellent opportunities for the growth of commerce. It is not accidental that European commerce developed first, and had its chief seats around the Mediterranean and the Baltic.

As if to facilitate communication, Europe is traversed from north to south by many rivers, which in the Middle Age were the highways of travel and traffic. The Rhine and the rivers of France are connected with each other and with the Rhone and its tributaries by a short portage, in the same way the Rhine, the Main, the Elbe, and the Oder are connected with the Danube, likewise the Vistula, the Niemen, and the Duna, with the Dniester the Dnieper, the Don, and the Volga. In this way nature has done much to promote intercourse in Europe. A radically different arrangement of the rivers of Europe would have affected its history in a corresponding way. Especially the districts about the mouths of the rivers were likely to be hastened in their development because of their greater opportunities for commerce and the advantages to be derived therefrom. The national existence of Portugal, Holland, and Belgium is due in some measure to the fact that they lie about the mouths of great rivers.

The climate of a country influences its people in many ways. Long and cold winters make the conditions of life in the north much more difficult than in the south where unaided nature does almost everything. In this way the habits of the people, their dress, social life, and architecture, public as well as private, are greatly influenced by the widely varying climatic conditions that prevail in the various parts of Europe.

In the third century the Roman empire extended from the Atlantic in the west to the Euphrates in the east, from the Sahara in the south to the Danube, Main, and Rhine in the north. Britain also had been added



to this territory. But since the beginning of the Christian era, the boundaries of the empire had not been greatly enlarged, for the task of defending the frontiers, rapidly becoming more difficult, left successive emperors little time to think of foreign conquests. ✓

Within this vast empire was to be found a great variety of peoples, differing in race, language, customs, and religion

*A. The inhabitants of the Empire.* The policy of Rome was to give all these peoples her own civilization as fast as they were able to receive it. As soon as the conquest of a province had been made, influences were set to work to

Romanize its inhabitants. This great work of Romanization and civilization was practically completed when, in 215 A.D., Caracalla issued an edict making all the free inhabitants of the empire citizens of Rome. There were still, of course, many differences existing between the peoples of the various provinces, but they had all received the elements of Roman culture, and, since the many agencies for diffusing the Roman civilization were still in operation, they were all approaching the same high level which Rome herself had reached.

The inhabitants of the empire were divided into four classes: slaves, plebs, curials, and senators; but within each

*The people divided into classes.* of these four divisions there were various grades and shades of difference. The lot of the slaves was gradually growing better. In the country it

became customary to enrol them, thus attaching them to the soil, from which they could not be separated, and

*Slaves.* with which they were bought and sold. Further, masters were forbidden to kill their slaves, or to separate a slave from his wife and children.

To the class of plebs belonged all the free common people, whether small freeholders, tradesmen, labourers, or

*Plebs.* artisans. The freeholders were diminishing in numbers. Their lands were consumed by the increasing taxes, and they themselves either became serfs or ran away to the towns. The majority of the inhabitants of the cities and towns classified as plebs were free, but they had no political rights.

All who possessed twenty-five acres of land, or its equivalent, were regarded as "curials." On these fell the burdens of office-holding and the taxes, for the collection of which they were made responsible. *Curials.*

The ranks of the senatorial class were constantly increasing by the addition of all those who for any reason received the title of senator, or who were appointed by the emperor to one of the high offices. The senatorial honour was hereditary. The senators, having most of the soil *Senators* in their possession, were the richest people of the empire. Since they enjoyed exceptional privileges and immunities, the lot of the curials was made more grievous.

For the support of his army, his court, and the great number of clerks made necessary by the bureaucratic form of government, the emperor had to have immense sums of money, for the purpose of raising which many kinds of taxes *Taxes* were introduced. Taxes were levied on both lands and persons, on all sorts of manufacturing industries, on heirs, when they came into possession of their estates, on slaves when set free, and on the amount of the sales made by merchants. Tolls were collected on the highways and at bridges, duties at the city gates and in the harbours. Besides the above taxes, there were many kinds of special taxes, burdens, and services, such as the supplying of food, clothing, and quarters for the army; horses and waggons for the imperial use whenever demanded; and repairing of the roads, bridges, and temples. Most oppressive of all, perhaps, was the dishonesty of the officials, who, to enrich themselves, often exacted far more than even the very large sums which the emperor required.

It was impossible that this should not tend to make the empire bankrupt. The cities were the first to suffer. As the senatorial class, the army, professors of rhetoric, and the clergy were largely freed from taxation, the whole burden *Effects on the curials* fell on the curials, who became oppressors in order to collect the vast sums required of them. Finally, when the curials were bankrupt and could no longer pay the taxes, they

attempted in every way to escape from their class. Some of them succeeded in rising into the senatorial ranks, many of them deserted their lands and became slaves, or entered the army or the Church. The emperors, trying to prevent this, often seized the curial who had run away and compelled him to take up his old burden again. The curial was forbidden by law to try to change his position, but in spite of this many of them surrendered their lands to some rich neighbour and received them back on condition of the payment of certain taxes, and the rendering of certain services. This was a form of land-tenure and social relation very similar to that common in feudalism of a later day.

In the fourth century A.D. the Kelts held Gaul (modern France) and the islands of Great Britain. Four or five hundred years before Christ, they had extended as far east as the Weser in the north, and occupied much territory in the centre of Europe. Evidence of this is the fact that Bohemia derived its name from its Keltic inhabitants, the Boii. But the Kelts slowly withdrew before the Germans, until the Rhine became the boundary between the two peoples. The Kelts were never all united in one great state, but existed in separate tribes. Each tribe formed a state and was governed by an aristocracy. The people had no part in the government, but were treated by the ruling class as slaves. The nobility was divided into two classes, the religious and the secular. The religious nobility were the Druids, a caste of priests who controlled all sacrifices, both public and private, and who were also judges and final authorities in all other matters. Their word was law, and whoever refused them obedience was put under their ban, which had almost the same meaning as the papal ban a few centuries later. They had many gods, to whom they offered human sacrifices.<sup>1</sup>

The Kelts had large, strong, and beautiful bodies, as may be seen from the famous statue in Rome, "The Dying Gaul"

<sup>1</sup> Caesar, B. G., vi. 11-19, gives a good description of the Kelts

(formerly known as the "Dying Gladiator"). They were brave, dashing warriors, fond of music, especially of the *Keltic char-shrill*, martial kind, with which they went into battle *at times*. They were easily moved by eloquent speech and had a love for poetry. Their language was well developed, and capable of expressing a wide range of thought and emotion. They loved bright and gay colours, and were noted for the liveliness rather than for the persistency of their feelings and emotions. They were restless, sprightly, full of activity, and capable of the greatest enthusiasm for, and devotion to, a popular leader, but they were fickle and unreliable if their ardour was once quenched by disaster. At the beginning of our period the Kelts who occupied Gaul and Britain were thoroughly Romanized. To a great extent they had forgotten their language and spoke Latin. Many cities had sprung up among them which were well supplied with temples, baths, and theatres, and were in all respects Roman. But the Kelts of Ireland, Wales, and Scotland were still barbarian, and hostile to Rome.

At the beginning of our period the Germans occupied Scandinavia, and nearly all the land between the *C The* Rhine and the Vistula, and the Baltic and the *Germans* Danube. Since the times of Cæsar and Tacitus, who were the first Roman authors to devote much attention to the Germans, many changes had taken place among them. Some of them had changed their location, new groups *Their loca-* had been formed, and they were known by new *tion* names. The Goths had left the Vistula and were now spread over a great stretch of territory to the north of the Black Sea and the lower Danube. Other tribes were moving or spreading out in the same direction. Great masses of Germans and other peoples were crowded together along the whole northern frontier of the empire, and the danger of a barbarian invasion was rapidly growing greater.

Tacitus ("Germania," ii.) says that the Germans were divided into three great branches, the Ingævones, the Hermiones, *Divisions* who lived nearest the ocean; the Istævones, who lived in the "middle", and the Istævones, who included all the

rest These three names had now been replaced by others, such as Franks, Alamanni, and Saxons. Neither these nations nor those mentioned by Tacitus actually included all the Germans. They formed rather the great division which may be called the West Germans. Besides these there were those of the north, afterward known as the Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes, and those of the east: the Goths, Vandals, and others.

In their government the Germans were democratic. They had a well-defined system of local self-government. There *Their gov-* were three political divisions; the whole tribe, or *ernment.* nation; the *gau*, or county; and the village. All matters that concerned only the village were discussed and settled by all the freemen of the village in a public meeting. Likewise the affairs of the *gau* were administered by the freemen of the *gau*, and matters that concerned the whole nation were decided by an assembly of all the freemen of the tribe. In social rank, there were three classes—nobles, freemen, and slaves. The nobles had certain advantages, but in the assemblies the vote of a freeman equalled that of a nobleman.

It was customary among the Germans for the young men to attach themselves to some man of tried courage and military ability (the *comitatus* or *Gefolge*), with whom they *Gefolge.* lived, and whom they accompanied on all his expeditions. Such warrior-chiefs were proud of having a large number of young men about them, for it added to their dignity and increased their power in many ways. The relation between a leader and a follower was entirely voluntary, and consequently honourable to both. It might be terminated at the will of either party.

The religion of the Germans was a kind of nature-worship. The principal objects of their reverence were groves, trees, caves, and uncommon natural phenomena. They had no *Religion and* priest-caste. They lived by cattle-raising, agri- *occupa-* culture, and hunting, the labour being performed *tions* principally by slaves and women. It was characteristic of them that they were unwilling to live in compactly built towns; their houses being generally some distance apart, formed a

straggling village. The Romans were impressed with the great size and power of their bodies, the ruddiness of their faces, and the light colour of their hair.

They had some very prominent faults, such as a too great love of war, of the cup, and of the dice. They became so infatuated with gambling that, after losing all their property, they staked their wives and children, and if these were lost, they risked even their own liberty. The Germans boasted of their faithfulness to every obligation. So true were they to their word that if they lost their freedom in gambling they willingly yielded to their new master, and permitted themselves to be reduced to the position of slaves.

The Slavs occupied a large belt of territory east of the Germans, and extended far into Russia. As the Germans withdrew to the west and south, the Slavs followed them and took possession of the land thus vacated. In this way they finally came as far west as the Elbe, and may be said to have held nearly all of the territory from the Elbe to the Dnieper. A large part of what is now Prussia, Saxony, and Bohemia became wholly Slavic.

The Slavs, as well as the Kelts and Germans, were broken up into many tribes having no political connection with each other. They seem to have had a patriarchal form of government. At any rate, great reverence was shown the old men of the tribe, who, by virtue of their age, had a controlling voice in the management of affairs. At first the Slavs probably had no nobility. They elected their leaders in war, and so strong was the democratic spirit among them that they were never able to produce a royal line.

Their religion was a form of idolatry. They had priests who were consulted on all matters, political and religious. Though they had powerful frames and impressed the Romans with their size, they were tame and unwarlike, and have never been conquerors. Their location was favourable to the occupations of cattle-raising and agriculture. They did not possess a strong national feeling, and were there-

fore easily assimilated by other peoples. Large numbers of them were Germanized from the ninth century onwards.

In the ninth century another branch of the Slavs, called the Letts, came into history. We first meet them on the shore of the Baltic, from the Vistula to some distance beyond the Nieman. They were divided into Lithuanians and Prussians. It is curious to note that the name of this non-German people (the Prussians) has, in the process of time, come to be applied to the leading German state of to-day.

Besides these Indo-European peoples which we have just discussed there were others, which are usually called Ural-Altaic or Finnic-Turkish tribes. "Turanian" is also applied to them. They were to be found in northern Scandinavia and in the northern, north-western, and eastern parts of Russia. They were the Finns, the Lapps, the Esthonians, the Livonians, the Ugrians, the Tchuds, the Permians, the Magyars, the Huns, and many others. They were related to the Turkish Mongols. During the Middle Age, at least, they in no way advanced the interests of civilization, but rather played the part of a scourge—destroyers rather than builders.

The division followed above is linguistic. Philologists first discovered the similarity between the languages of the Greeks, the Romans, the Kelts, the Germans, the Slavs, the Letts, the Persians, and the ancient inhabitants of India, and on the basis of these resemblances classed these peoples together as one great race. It was inferred that because their languages were akin, the people themselves must have been of the same original stock. The modern sciences of anthropology and ethnology do not recognize the validity of such an argument, but declare that these peoples do not belong to the same race, although their languages are related. Ethnologists now use other tests to discover the racial relations of peoples.

*Basis of  
above classification  
philological,  
not recognized by  
ethnologists.*

## CHAPTER I

### THE EMPIRE, THE CHURCH, AND THE INVASIONS OF THE GERMANS

#### LITERATURE.—1. FOR THE EMPIRE. Capes, *Age of the Antonines*

Curteis, *History of the Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius the Great to the Coronation of Charles the Great*

Sheppard, *Fall of Rome and Rise of New Nationalities*

Hodgkin, *The Dynasty of Theodosius, or Seventy Years' Struggle with the Barbarians*

Penn. Univ., *Translations*, Vols. IV, 1-2, VI., 3-4.

Dyer, *The City of Rome . . . from Its Foundation to the End of the Middle Ages*

Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*.

Hodgkin, *The Letters of Cassiodorus, Italy and Her Invaders* 8 vols

2 FOR ENGLAND Freeman, *Origin of the English Nation*.

Powell and Tout, *History of England*

S. R. Gardiner, *Students' History of England*

Robertson, *Making of the English Nation*, 55 B C — 1135 A D.

Green, *Short History of the English People*.

Green, *Making of England*

Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English* Edited by C. PLUMMER

Green, *History of the English People*. 4 vols.

Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*

Taswell—Langmead, *Constitutional History of England*

3. FOR THE CHURCH Collins, *The Beginnings of English Christianity*

Skene, *Keltic Scotland*

Fisher, *Beginnings of Christianity*

Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History*.

Mason, *The Mission of St Augustine*

See also GENERAL LITERATURE

AUGUSTUS brought about a change in the form of government of the Roman state, which, for nearly two hundred years, was attended with large benefits. Even under the vicious emperors of the first century the people were probably in a better condition than during the last days of the republic. The emperors cleared the sea of pirates and the land of brigands and robbers; they

*The Republic of Rome becomes an empire,*  
31 B C.



built roads connecting all parts of the empire, thus making commerce easier; their excellent police made travel safer; they administered justice more equitably, and the government, being better centralized, performed its functions with greater efficiency.

The wise emperors of the second century, while making progress in nearly every direction, gave the empire an increasingly good and beneficent government. But the death of Marcus Aurelius (181 A.D.) put a check to the long period of prosperity, and for about a hundred years the empire was rent with revolts and seditions. The law governing the succession to the crown was often disregarded. Once the army put the crown up for sale to the highest bidder and, at another time, there were at least nineteen persons who, in different parts of the empire, assumed the imperial title. During the third century many of the emperors met a violent death at the hands of a usurper. The crown was regarded by ambitious men as a legitimate object of prey.

Diocletian tried to put an end to this chaos by devising a scheme for fixing the succession and making the persons of the emperors more secure. He arranged that there should be two emperors, each having an assistant, called a Cæsar. The two emperors, after ruling twenty years, were to resign in favour of the two Cæsars, who would then choose two other Cæsars to assist them. To render the lives of the four rulers more secure, they were to be shut off from free intercourse with the people, and each was to be surrounded by a court modelled after eastern ideals. The government was to be more centralized, the senate deprived of its little remaining power, and heavy taxes were to be levied to meet the increased expenses of the government. This scheme was successful only in part. The resignation of Diocletian and Maximian (305) was followed by a civil war, which gave Constantine the opportunity to make himself sole ruler. But Constantine, although he overthrew the essential part of Diocletian's scheme, did not return

*Decline of  
the Empire  
in the third  
century*

*The changes  
of Dio-  
cletian,  
284-305.*

to the simplicity of the former emperors; on the contrary, he increased his court, and multiplied the expenses of his government.

Of the emperors of the third century, however, many were barbarians who had little or no regard for Rome. Either by preference or necessity, they spent their time in the provinces or on the frontier. When Diocletian and Maximian divided the government the emperor in the east took up his residence at Nicomedia, while the emperor in the west lived in Milan. Constantine, led by various motives, chose for his residence Byzantium, which after fortifying and enlarging, he called Constantinople. Rome thus lost her position as capital of the empire, being replaced by Constantinople, or New Rome, as it was called.

Constantine earned the gratitude of his Christian subjects by making Christianity a legal religion. The conservatism of the emperors had led them to forbid the practice of all new religions, then fears caused them to regard the harmless meetings of the Christians as dangerous gatherings of conspirators. From the first, therefore, Christianity was proscribed until soon it came to be understood that the mere name of Christian was an offence against the state. To be a Christian was to be worthy of death. While the Christians were generally treated with leniency by the government they suffered much at the hands of the mob, who attributed all disasters to them. During the first three centuries there were several persecutions, mostly of a local character, but in the year 303, Diocletian, at the instigation of his Cæsar, Galerius, began a fierce persecution of the Christians, which was intended utterly to destroy the new religion. "Christian churches were to be destroyed; all copies of the Bible were to be burned, all Christians were to be deprived of public office and civil rights; and, at last all, without exception, were to sacrifice to the gods upon pain of death." After eight bloody years Galerius confessed that the Christians were too strong for him, and published a proclamation granting them toleration

Two years later Constantine went a step farther and issued an edict ordering all Church property which had been confiscated to be restored to the Christians. It was the policy of Constantine to further Christianity. In 313 he released the Catholic clergy from many burdensome political duties. In 315 he freed the Church from the payment of certain taxes. Probably in 316 he made legal the manumission of slaves which took place in churches. In 321, churches were granted the privilege of receiving legacies. In 323 he forbade the compulsory attendance of Christians at heathen worship and celebrations. Up to 323 the coins which he struck bore the images and inscriptions of various gods; after that time his coins had only allegorical emblems. But though thus favouring Christianity, Constantine never in any way limited or prohibited heathenism. He retained the office and performed the duties of *pontifex maximus*. In 321 he issued an edict commanding that officials should consult the *haruspices* (soothsayers). After the year 326 he permitted a temple to be erected to himself, and allowed himself to be worshipped. At his death he was enrolled among the gods and received the title of Divus. It is evident, therefore, that the famed conversion of Constantine was political rather than religious. His principal interest was centred in the unity of the Church, which he wished to use as a tool in the work of governing the empire. He did not make Christianity the state religion; he made it merely a legal religion. It remained for Gratian (375-383) and Theodosius (379-395) to make orthodox Christianity the only legal religion, by forbidding heathen worship and persecuting all heresy. They decreed that only orthodox Christians should have the rights of citizenship.

Before his death (337), Constantine divided the government among his four sons, who covered themselves with shame by waging war on each other, and by murdering their relatives in order to remove all competitors for the throne. One cousin, however, Julian, was spared, and in

*Constantine  
and the  
Church.*

*Christianity  
made the  
only legal  
religion.*

*Julian the  
Apostate*

361 became emperor. The cruel treatment which he had received from his Christian cousins, together with his love, inspired by his pagan tutors, for the heathen religion, had made him hostile to Christianity. When he came to the throne he therefore tried to destroy Christianity and restored heathenism. But failing completely, for his pains he won the hatred of the Christians and the title, Apostate.

Although Diocletian's scheme had failed, it was apparent that one man could not satisfactorily fill the office of emperor. After several ineffectual attempts at division, Theodosius the Great arranged that, at his death, his first son, Arcadius, should succeed to the government in the east, with his residence at Constantinople, and his second son, Honorius, should rule in the west, with Milan for his capital. Practically this had the effect of making two empires, but the people of that time did not think of the matter in that way. They regarded the empire as indivisible, only the duties of the emperor could be divided. In spite of this division of labour the fifth century was full of reverses and disasters. The emperors were, for the most part, weak and worthless, and often mere puppets in the hands of some ambitious and scheming barbarian. At length, the following circumstances led to the deposition of the emperor in the west and the nominal reunion of the east and the west under one emperor. The Roman army, was, in the fifth century, largely composed of German mercenaries, who finally began to ask the government for lands on which they might settle. When Romulus Augustulus, a mere boy, became emperor (476) with his father, Orestes, the power behind the throne, the Germans in the army peremptorily demanded that one-third of the land in Italy should be divided among them. This demand Orestes refused. They thereupon put themselves under the leadership of Odovacar, a clever soldier of fortune, to take by force what had been denied them. In the war which followed, Orestes was slain, the little emperor made a prisoner, and compelled to come before the senate to resign his office. At the command

*Two Emperors rule,*  
395.

of Odovacar the senate wrote a letter to Zeno, the emperor at Constantinople, telling him what had taken place, and adding that, in their judgment, one emperor was able to rule the whole empire. They further asked him to appoint Odovacar governor of the province of Italy. After some delay, Zeno granted their request, and thus, in the year 476, the whole empire was again nominally under one emperor, whose seat was permanently fixed at Constantinople. But as a matter of fact, the authority of the emperor was no longer felt in many parts of the west. Some of the fairest provinces of the empire were occupied by Germans who had invaded the empire and settled on the soil, establishing a rude government of their own over the provincials.

The Germans, who had once lived east of the Rhine and along the Baltic, had gradually moved west and south, threatening the Rhine and Danube frontiers. During the second and third centuries they made frequent marauding excursions into the empire. Asia Minor, the whole Balkan peninsula, and the eastern part of Gaul suffered much at their hands. In 376 the invading army of the Huns attacked the West Goths, who, to save themselves, hastily crossed the Danube, a hundred thousand in number, and begged the emperor to give them lands. The emperor settled them on lands south of the Danube, made them *federati* (allies), and promised them yearly a gift of grain. They retained their arms, gave hostages to keep the peace, and agreed to furnish a contingent of troops for the Roman army. The Roman officials, however, soon began to oppress and defraud them, and in 378 they revolted and plundered the country. The emperor, Valens, hastened with his army to meet them, but was slain in battle near Adrianople (378). Theodosius the Great adopted a wise policy of conciliation toward them, and after some years succeeded in persuading them to return to the lands which had formerly been given them. In 395 the spirit of restlessness again took possession of them, and under the leadership of their newly-elected king, Alaric, they ravaged

the Balkan peninsula. After some years of residence in Illyria and Noricum, they made a successful invasion of Italy (408), took and sacked Rome (410), and spread themselves over the country, carrying desolation wherever they went. In the expectation of crossing over to Africa the next spring, Alaric pitched his camp near Cosenza, where he soon fell a prey to Italian fever. His brother-in-law, Athaulf, who was elected to succeed him, made peace with the emperor and received lands for his people in Gaul and Spain. After some years of fighting, Athaulf was able to establish his people on the lands ceded him. They were eventually driven out of Gaul, but held Spain till 711, when the Mohammedans conquered them and put an end to their kingdom.

*Sack of Rome, 410*

*Death of Alaric, 410*

*The kingdom of the West Goths*

This invasion of the empire by the West Goths was soon followed by many others. The defence on the frontier seemed suddenly to fail, thus exposing the empire to the inroads of the barbarians. In the year 404 Ratger, who had become the leader of one division of the East Goths, led about 200,000 of them from Pannonia into Italy. After ravaging the northern provinces he was slain by the emperor's forces and his army completely destroyed.

*Invasion of Ratger, 404*

A large army of Vandals and Suevi crossed the middle Rhine during the winter of 406-7, and proceeded slowly through Gaul, devastating the country as they went. Encountering the West Goths in southern Gaul, they were driven by them over the Pyrenees. The

*Vandals and Suevi, 406.*

Suevi were gradually forced into north-western Spain, where they established an obscure kingdom, which was eventually conquered and annexed by the West Goths (585).

The Vandals, after having been driven by the West Goths into southern Spain, crossed over into Africa, 80,000 strong, and took possession of the rich provinces there. Their first king, Geiseric, had a large amount of barbarian cunning and shrewdness, but was cruel and treacherous. By oppressing and persecuting the orthodox provincials he made himself feared and hated

*The kingdom of the Vandals, 429-534.*

He extended his power by conquering the islands of the western Mediterranean, and, in 455, he sacked Rome itself. His people, however, were weakened by the climate and by their excesses, and in the next century were easily overcome by the emperor's troops (533-34).

The Burgundians left their home between the Oder and the Vistula about the middle of the third century, and in a few years we find them on the Rhine and the Main. *The Burgundians,* 443-534. The territory about Worms was granted them in 413. The scene of many parts of the Nibelungen Lied, which contains the Burgundian traditions of that period, is laid in and about Worms. After various fortunes the emperor's officer, Aetius, in 443, transferred them to the territory south of the Lake of Geneva, from which they extended their power, till, in 473, they had reached the Mediterranean. But they were not able to resist the encroachments of the Franks, their powerful neighbours on the north, by whom they were conquered and absorbed (534).

A federation of tribes, known as the Alamanni, took possession of the Black Forest, southern Germany, and northern Switzerland, but, like the Burgundians, their independence, also, was cut short by the Franks (496). *The Alamanni,* 496.

Although racked by these German invaders, Europe was now called to suffer from a still more barbarous foe, the Huns. After taking possession of south-eastern Europe in the last quarter of the fourth century, the course of the Huns to the west was temporarily checked. They seem not to have remained long united, but to have broken up into groups, some of which went into the service of the empire. After awhile a new leader appeared in the person of Rugilas, who did much to bring them together again. At his death (435) he was succeeded by two nephews, Bleda and Attila, who ruled jointly till about 444, when Attila caused Bleda to be assassinated. *Attila and the Huns.* By diplomatic means, as well as by force, Attila united all the peoples, of whatever race, between the Volga and the Rhine. With an army com-

posed largely of Huns and Germans, he more than once ravaged the eastern empire, even crossing into Asia, carrying the war into Armenia, Syria, the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, and threatening Persia. Constantinople was once in danger from him, and was compelled to pay him a heavy ransom. At length, in 450, he turned his attention to the west. With an immense army he crossed the Rhine, ravaged northern Gaul, and was moving towards the south when his march was stopped by the defence of Orleans. Aetius, the commander of the imperial army in the west, gathered together all the forces possible and went to assist the city. Attila withdrew to the "Catalaunian Fields" (the exact location of which is unknown), where he was defeated (451) in a great battle. He retreated to his capital in Pannonia, a village near the modern Tokai, on the Theiss river. The next summer he invaded and ravaged northern Italy, but was compelled to retreat, because of the fever which broke out in his army, and the approach of the army under Aetius. Luckily for Europe he died in 453.

Though a barbarian, Attila was by no means a savage. He practised the arts of diplomacy, often sent and received embassies, and respected the international laws and customs which then existed. His residence presented a strong mixture of barbarism and luxury. His small wooden houses were filled with the rich plunder carried off in his many invasions of Roman territory. He despised Rome and her civilization, and hoped to erect an empire of his own on her ruins. He had among his following several Greeks, through whose written accounts of him, his conquests, and his kingdom, he hoped to become immortal. At his death his empire fell rapidly to pieces. His son, *Ellä*, attempted to quell the revolting tribes, but lost his life in battle (454). All the German and Slavic peoples which had obeyed Attila and added to his strength now became independent, and were once more able to trouble the empire.

Italy, as we have seen, fell, in 476, into the hands of Odo-



vacar, who had at his back a large army composed principally of Germans. Theoretically he was subject to the emperor,

*The rule of* but practically he was independent. He gave Italy  
*Odovacar,* an excellent government, restoring peace and enforc-  
 476-493. ing the laws. Under his rule prosperity was rapidly

returning, and Italy was beginning to recover from the long period of misrule and violence. In 487 Odovacar attacked the Rugians in Pannonia and defeated them, but their prince fled

to the East Goths and begged for their protection.

*The East* The East Goths, under their king, Theodoric, were  
*Goths in-* living along the middle Danube. Since the  
*vade Italy,* emperor was not able to control them, they kept  
 489 the peace or ravaged the country as it pleased them.

Theodoric embraced the opportunity to invade Italy with his whole people, and the emperor, glad to be rid of such troublesome neighbours, gave his consent. It was immaterial to the emperor which of the two barbarians should rule Italy, since he was not able to rule it himself. In 489 Theodoric entered Italy and, after four years of fighting, made peace with Odovacar, agreeing to rule Italy jointly with him. Nevertheless, during the celebration of the peace thus concluded, Theodoric had Odovacar basely murdered (493). Theodoric, now without a rival, took possession of the country, assigned land to his people, and established them in fixed residence.

*The reign of* He ruled Italy as king of the East Goths, making  
*Theodoric,* use of the machinery of government which he  
 493-526. found already in existence there, and filling the

offices with Romans. He developed an activity of the widest range. He restored the aqueducts and walls of many cities, repaired the roads, drained marshes, reopened mines, cared for public buildings, promoted agriculture, established markets, preserved the peace, administered justice strictly, and enforced the laws. By inter-marriages and treaties he tried to maintain peace between all the neighbouring German kingdoms, that they might not mutually destroy each other. He knew that if the Germans were weakened by wars among themselves the emperors would easily conquer them. At his death (526) the

trouble which arose about the succession led to the invasion of Italy by the emperor, Justinian. After nearly twenty years of war, the armies of the emperor were successful, the kingdom of the East Goths was destroyed, and Italy again became a province of the empire.

*The end of  
the kingdom  
of the East  
Goths, 553.*

Beyond the frontier there were still several German tribes which were only beginning to come into contact with the empire. Such were the Bavarians, the Lombards, the Thuringians, while the Saxons, the Angles, the Jutes, had no knowledge of the empire. The Franks, composed of many tribes, and settled along the lower Rhine, gradually spread through northern Gaul. Their history is reserved for a subsequent chapter.

*Other Ger-  
man tribes.*

The most remote province in the west, Britannia, was also invaded by Germans from the main-land, who slowly wrested the country from its inhabitants. This invasion began about 449, the Jutes first taking possession of Kent.

*Germans  
settle in  
Britain,  
449*

Other settlements were soon made which grew into little kingdoms, such as Sussex, Wessex, Essex, East Anglia, Northumbria, and Mercia. These kingdoms fought first against the Keltic inhabitants, and then against each other. The final struggle, between North-

*Supremacy  
of Wessex,  
802-39.*

umbria, Mercia, and Wessex, resulted in favour of Wessex. Eggerht, king of Wessex (802-39), made himself the overlord of all England.

These Anglo-Saxons established in Britain a pure German state. The Roman civilization was gone; there was nothing to prevent their free development along the lines peculiar to themselves. Their Anglo-Saxon dialect developed into a literary language almost un-

*England  
remains  
German.*

influenced by Latin. It was spoken everywhere. As early as 680 Cædmon had sung the "Song of Creation" in his mother-tongue, and parts, at least, of the heathen poem "Beowulf" were already in existence. The laws of the people, written down in Anglo-Saxon, rather than in Latin, as were the laws of all the Germanic kingdoms on the continent, show

that the government, legal ideas, and customs, which the people had had on the continent were not influenced by Rome and her civilization. As a result England has now the purest Germanic law of any country in existence—purer than in Germany itself, where, owing to the later connection between that country and the empire, Roman law prevailed over the Germanic.

The Anglo-Saxons parcelled out their lands to groups probably of about a hundred warriors. The land which such a group received was then divided among its members and they settled in villages. Their residences were called after the "*Ham*" name of the family, with the addition of "-ham" or and "*tun*." "-tun" (English, "home" and "town"; German, "Heim" and "Zaun"). "Ham" had the meaning of "dwelling," and "tun" signified the wall or fence which enclosed the village or place of defence. Probably all the free-  
*Democratic government* men of the hundred met and determined all questions that concerned the welfare of the hundred. A still higher court, composed of all the freemen of the whole tribe, was assembled whenever questions that concerned the whole tribe were to be decided or disputes between the hundreds were to be settled. It is probable that it was early found to be impracticable to get all the freemen together as often as was desirable, and this led to the introduction of a kind of representation. A small number of men were probably sent from each township to the *hundredmoot*, and the same number sent from each hundred to the *folkmoot*. The same social distinctions were perpetuated as had existed among them on the continent. There were three classes: the noblemen or *ealdormen*, the freemen or *ceorls*, and the slaves. The *comitatus* was, of course, quickly modified, the followers of a leader being called *thanes* as soon as they got lands and left the immediate presence of their leaders.

The Christianization of Ireland is veiled in obscurity, but it seems probable that St Patrick (died in 465 or 493) was the *Christianity* first missionary who met with very much success  
*in Ireland.* there. Under him the whole island became Christian, though it was in a low state of civilization, and in

the next centuries won so great a reputation for its piety that it was called "The Isle of Saints." The Church of Ireland was independent of Rome, and differed in some respects from the Church on the continent. The type of Christianity established there was thoroughly ascetic and monastic. The ascetic zeal of the Irish led them to try to convert the world to their form of Christianity. It was not so much what is now called the "missionary spirit," as the desire to undergo hardships of all kinds. To travel in foreign lands as a *Irish Missionary* (*peregrinare pro Christo*) was, because of *missionaries*, its difficulties, a meritorious work. In accordance with their ascetic ideas, they settled not in the cities but in the wilds. Their first settlements were in Scotland. In 563 St Columba (or St Columbcille) sailed with twelve fellow-monks to Scotland, where the Island of Iona was given them, from which, occasionally re-enforced by other monks from Ireland, they carried on their work on the main-land. They laboured not only in Scotland, but also among the Anglo-Saxons of Britain and on the continent. Lindisfarne, on the east coast of England, was occupied by them, and for a long time was a centre of missionary activity among the Angles.

On his accession Oswald (634-42), king of Northumbria, having once been sheltered in the monastery of Iona, sent to its abbot for missionaries. St Aidan, and after *Orthodox missionaries among the Anglo-Saxons* him, St Cuthbert, met with great success, and it seemed for some time that the Church of Ireland would extend itself over the whole of Great Britain. But there was another stream of missionary activity beginning to move to the west which had its source in Rome. In 596, Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, sent a monk, Augustine, with about thirty companions, to Kent. Aethelberht, king of Kent, had recently married Bertha, an orthodox Frankish princess, who now exerted all her influence in favour of the missionaries, and within a year the king and many of his nobles accepted Christianity and were baptized.

From Kent the orthodox form spread slowly to the north, constantly nearing the boundaries of the Irish faith. Finally

they met face to face in Northumbria. A bitter struggle arose ;  
*England chooses the Roman Catholic Church, 664.* the king, who was in doubt, called a council at Whitby (664) to listen to the arguments of both parties. Wilfrid, a priest, spoke for the Roman Church, while Colman defended the claims of the Irish missionaries. Colman continually quoted St Columba, but Wilfrid declared that St Peter was of greater authority because he was the prince of the apostles and because Jesus had said to him, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." When Wilfrid spoke these words the king became very much interested, he had apparently never heard them before. He asked Colman whether they had really been said to St Peter, and Colman admitted that they had. The king then asked whether similar authority had been given to St Columba, and Colman confessed that it had not. At this the king replied, "This is a doorkeeper whom I am unwilling to offend, lest, when I come to the gates of heaven, if he, who is admitted to have the keys, is opposed to me, there may be none to open to me." Thus the Roman Church won the day and the Irish missionaries were compelled to withdraw from England. The decision brought England into close connection with the continent, especially with the bishop of Rome, assured the influence of Rome, and so affected all the future of English history. Through the Church, Roman legal ideas, usages, and modes of thought, in short, the remains of Rome's civilization, were gradually imported, greatly to her advantage, into England.

*Bede, History of the English III., 25.* Theodore of Tarsus, a learned Greek, came to England as archbishop of Canterbury (669-90), and by virtue of his high position organized the English Church around Canterbury as the centre and head. He divided all the territory into bishoprics, and introduced the parish system. The whole Church of England was bound to the bishop of Rome. The church organization did not follow the boundaries of the kingdoms, but all were impressed with the fact that the Church

was one, and could recognize no political or national lines. The idea of the unity of the Church had great influence on the political ideas, and helped prepare the minds of the people for the idea of the political unity of the whole country. *One Church, one kingdom.*

The learning of the monks of England was considerable. While Greek was utterly unknown in the west of Europe, it was mastered by some of the pupils of Theodore. The monasteries contained many monks who were excellent scholars. Most famous of all was Bede, *Monasticism and learning. Bede.* known as the Venerable Bede (673-735), a monk of Jarrow. He had for his pupils the six hundred monks of that monastery, besides the many strangers who came to hear him. He gradually mastered all the learning of his day, and left at his death forty-five volumes of his writings, the most important of which are "The Ecclesiastical History of the English," and his translation of the gospel of John into English. His writings were widely known and used throughout Europe. He reckoned all dates from the birth of Christ, and through his works the use of the Christian chronology became common in Europe. Owing to the large number of monasteries and monks in Northumbria, that part of England was far in advance of the south in civilization.

Of all the kingdoms whose beginnings we have thus far traced, only two, those of the Franks and the Anglo-Saxons, were to survive the dangers which beset their existence and to become powerful states, all the others lost their political independence, and were either destroyed or absorbed by the peoples among whom they had settled.

From the foregoing account it is apparent that, about 500 A.D., the western part of the empire was held by barbarians whose rulers were practically independent of the emperor. The Germans always demanded land on which they might settle and, in general, it may be said that they took one-third of the soil of the conquered province, distributing it among themselves. They brought with them their peculiar customs. *See Map No. 2. The Germans demand lands.*

and laws, which were eventually reduced to writing and have been preserved for us.\* The German demanded to be tried and judged by the laws of his own tribe. He regarded his tribal law as a personal possession which he carried with him wherever he went. This conception of law, known as personal, was opposed to the Roman, which was territorial.

All the Germans, except the Franks and the Anglo-Saxons, had been converted to Christianity before they settled in the

*Arianism among the Germans.* empire. But, unfortunately for them, their faith was now regarded as heretical, being known as Arianism. This was a form of Unitarianism. The provincials among whom they settled hated them, both as foreign conquerors and as heretics. There could, therefore, be little free intercourse between the two peoples.

## CHAPTER II

### THE REACTION OF THE EMPIRE AGAINST THE GERMANS

LITERATURE —Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*

Bury, *Later Roman Empire*.

Capes, *University Life in Ancient Athens*

Gibbon, *Roman Empire*

Adams, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*

Oman, *The Dark Ages*, 476-918

ALTHOUGH there was more or less friendly intercourse between the various Germanic kingdoms and the court of Constantinople, the situation was far from pleasing to the emperor. The barbarians had invaded his territory; they were unwelcome guests whom he must entertain because he did not have the power to drive them out. Of this weakness they took advantage, and ruled with such independence that their lands were practically cut off from the empire. Such a loss of territory was regarded as a great disgrace, which could be removed only by the reconquest of the lost provinces. In an absolute government everything depends on the ability of the monarch. The anarchy and violence of the fourth and fifth centuries were possible because of the weak emperors and the internal feuds and dissensions. The weak rulers of these centuries were followed by a succession of able men, chief of whom was Justinian. In him the reaction against the Germans reached its highest point. Under Zeno (474-91), Anastasius I. (491-518), and Justin I. (518-27), the empire slowly gathered strength, and the way was prepared for the brilliant activity of Justinian (527-65). The long period of neiplessness and weakness was followed by a great revival of strength, in which the palmy days of the empire seemed to



return. The imperial arms were again victorious, and large parts of the lost territory were reconquered and again united to the empire.

Justinian's claim to the title Great rests on his versatility and cleverness. His interests were of the widest range. He was *Justinian*, interested in building and architecture, in law and 527-65. theology, in commerce and manufactures, in war, diplomacy, and the art of governing. He was able to select men of ability to fill the highest positions and to work for him, he was inflexible in will and persisted with the greatest determination in the policy which he had once adopted.

His attention was called to the condition of the laws. They had never yet been collected and codified. There were many inconsistencies and contradictions among them; consequently the administration of justice was difficult. Justinian appointed a commission with Tribonian at its head, to collect, harmonize, and arrange the laws of the empire. This was done in such a way that all earlier collections were made useless, and hence, the most of them were soon destroyed. The laws themselves were gathered into one collection which has ever since been called the Codex of Justinian. Tribonian seems to have used the utmost freedom in treating the text of the laws. Many changes were made in order to reduce them to harmony. Besides the laws, the opinions, explanations, and decisions of famous judges and lawyers were collected. As in the practice of law to-day, much regard was had for precedent and decisions in similar cases, and these were brought together from all quarters in a collection called the Pandects. For the use of the law-students, a treatise on the general principles of Roman law was prepared, which was called the Institutes. Justinian himself carefully kept the laws which he promulgated, and afterward published them under the title of "Novellæ."

Immense sums of money were necessary to carry on the work which Justinian planned. The churches he built, the most famous of which is St Sophia, the walls and numerous

forts with which he sought to protect the empire, the fraud practised in the administration of the army and in the collection of the taxes; Justinian's lavish personal expenditures and the extravagance of the court, all so *Taxation.* increased the taxes that the financial ruin of the people was only a question of time.

Under Justinian Byzantine art took on its final form. A fixed style of church architecture was developed, the principal characteristics of which are the cupola and the *Byzantine* round arch. The churches were decorated with *art.* mosaics and paintings. In painting, also, certain types were accepted and forms established which became orthodox, and from which the Church would suffer no variation. These types and forms therefore existed for centuries without any change. In fact they are still observed and practised in the religious art of Russia and Greece.

Justinian regarded himself as the final authority in all ecclesiastical matters, both in doctrine and in polity. He himself was orthodox, and believed that it was the duty of the state to destroy heresy. Heretics were *Justinian and the Church* persecuted and deprived of the rights of citizenship. He treated the bishops of Rome as his officials. When they displeased him, he ordered them to come to Constantinople, and, as it seemed best to him, he reprimanded, imprisoned, and even deposed and exiled them. What may be called "home mission work" was carried on by the clergy at the command of Justinian. There were still large numbers of pagans in the empire. Nearly all the peasants were pagan, and even in Constantinople there were many heathen to be found. These were sought out and forced to accept Christianity or suffer persecution.

The greatest university of the world was, in this period, at Athens. Its professors were wholly pagan. So great was its fame, however, that even the Christian youth were *The university at Athens.* sent there to be educated. Some of the greatest of the Church fathers were trained in that university. In 529 Justinian closed the schools of Athens, and

forbade heathen philosophers to teach. They were practically exiled. Many of them fled to Persia, where they hoped to find the fullest liberty. In this they were disappointed, and after enduring persecutions there, they returned to the west.

The worst foes of the emperor were the people of Constantinople, who, because of their turbulence, kept him constantly in fear of a rebellion, and rendered it impossible for him to give his undivided attention to the affairs of state. There were two great factions in the capital, each of which had its partisans throughout the empire. These factions were divided on all questions, both political and religious. Their most common place of meeting was the circus, where each party railed at the other and endeavoured to win the favour and the patronage of the emperor. From the colours of the charioteers in the races the factions were known as the "Greens" and the "Blues." The Blues were orthodox and devoted to the house of Justinian, but the Greens were heterodox and secretly attached to the family of Anastasius.

Probably religious differences were the cause of the deepest hatred and at the bottom of all the trouble. During the long period while Christianity was fusing with the philosophy of the Greeks, and while the dogmas of the Church were being developed in accordance therewith (that is, during the first eight centuries, although the highest activity was reached from the third to the sixth century), the Greek intellectual world was in a state of the greatest fermentation and discussion. Even the humblest would have his say about the highest questions, and the greengrocer, the barber, and the cobbler were more interested in discussing metaphysical questions with their customers than in serving them<sup>1</sup>. The questions at issue were purely speculative, in regard to the person of Jesus and his relation to God. Arianism declared that Jesus was not God, and had

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon, chap. xxvii., quotes from Jortin a paraphrase of a passage in Gregory of Nyssa's Sermon on the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

not existed eternally, but had been created. He occupied, however, a much higher place than man. Orthodoxy was content with no other form of statement than one which would declare that Jesus was "the Son of God, begotten of the Father, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father." Furthermore, if Jesus was God, how was he at the same time man? What kind of body did he have? Did he have two natures, the divine and the human? two wills divine and human? How were these united? What was the relation between them? These and similar questions were discussed, not only in the Church councils, but at the court, in the streets, in the places of business, and, indeed, wherever people came together. Their discussion and study absorbed the attention of the best talent of the day. Still worse, they were fused with politics, and every political question was at the same time a religious one. It was inevitable that such a combination should add to the mutual hatred, intrigue, and treachery. Though Justinian's ambition made it impossible for him to submit tamely to the tyranny of these factions, for some years he found no means of overcoming them, and was compelled to suffer many indignities at their hands. In 532, however, in consequence of a riot, Justinian seized some of the leaders of both factions and ordered them to be put to death. But two of them were rescued by the people, and both parties, choosing Hypatius emperor, united and attacked Justinian. While Justinian was holding council with his advisers and planning to escape, Theodora, his wife, broke in upon them and declared that, although a woman, she had a right to be heard, since her interests were at stake. All must submit to death, but not to exile, dishonour, and the loss of the imperial dignity. She did not wish to live if she could not retain her rank as empress. If the emperor wished, he might flee, he had gold which he could take with him, the sea was at hand, and ships were ready. But she preferred to remain and die, since the imperial throne would be a glorious tomb. At her words,

*The Nicene Creed,  
Schaff, III  
667 ff*

*Theology  
and politics.*

*See Bury,  
Vol. I, pp  
333 ff.*

Justinian regained his courage and sent the imperial guard under Belisarius to attack the rioters, who had taken possession of the circus. The mob were taken off their guard, Belisarius put thousands to death, among them all the leaders. The power of the factions was thus broken. The city was now helpless in the emperor's hands, and he was consequently free to turn his attention to the larger policy on which he had already set his heart.

This policy was to recover all the lost provinces and restore the empire in all its extent. This necessitated the destruction

of the German kingdoms, and Justinian turned his attention to the west. His conquest of the Vandals in Africa and of the East Goths in Italy has already been mentioned. He also attacked the West Goths

in Spain (551), but was successful only in gaining a few places on the coast. By his intrigues, the German tribes north of the Danube, such as the Lombards, Gepidæ, and Heruli, were kept

at war with each other. But Justinian's anti-German policy was destined to fail because he was distracted from it by the wars which he was compelled to wage with the Persians, the Slavs, the Avars, and the

Bulgarians. Persia, under its great king, Chosroes

I. (531-79), was at the height of its power, and

Justinian was not able to cope successfully with this hereditary foe. His victory over the East Goths was delayed more than once, because he was compelled to use all his forces in the east; but in spite of his exertions he was defeated by the Persians, compelled to pay tribute, and to surrender some of

his territory in the east. The Slavs also interfered

with Justinian's plans. As the Germans deserted the territory south of the Baltic, the Slavs followed them and took possession of all the land as far west as the Elbe. They followed hard upon the heels of the withdrawing Bavarians, occupying Bohemia, Moravia, and many parts of modern Austria. More than once they crossed the Danube, ravaged the provinces, and even threatened Constantinople. They pressed into the Balkan peninsula and made settlements,

which have grown into the modern Bosnia, Dalmatia, Servia, and other Slavic principalities, now subject either to Turkey or Austria. A little later they colonized Greece. The Peloponnesus was so completely occupied by them that it came to be called Slavonia.

The Bulgarians were originally a Ural-Altaic people, but they came into Europe, settled among some Slavic tribes, and were absorbed by them. Nothing was left *The Bulgarians.* but their name, which came to be applied to the Slavs with whom they had fused. They lost their language, customs, and nationality, and became thoroughly Slavic. Year after year this mixed people invaded the empire and devastated many of its fairest districts. It was not till about 680 that they settled in the territory which they now occupy.

In 558 the Avars (Huns) invaded the empire from the east. After doing much damage they were *The Avars.* established by Karl the Great on the middle Danube, and were gradually swallowed up by the Slavs.

Luckily at the very time of Justinian's opposition to the Germans, the Germanic element in the empire was strengthened by the formation of the great tribe of the Bavarians, *New German tribes.* the settlement of the Lombards in Italy, and the growth of the Franks (which latter will be described in the succeeding chapter).

Some German tribes known as the Marcomanni had at one time occupied Bohemia (Bajahemum), from which they received the name Bavarians (Bajavarii, men of Bavaria). Shortly after 487 they left Bohemia and took possession of the territory which now bears their name, and from which they were never afterward removed.

After various wanderings, the Lombards had settled in Pannonia. They had become allies of the empire, and, at the instigation of Justinian, had made war on the Heruli, and then on the Gepidæ. Justinian had feared them, but did not live to see their invasion. After his successful completion of the war with the East Goths, Narses had been made ex-arch of Italy, with his residence at Ravenna. To

avenge his ill-treatment at the hands of Justin II., the successor of Justinian, he is said to have invited the Lombards to invade Italy, promising not to interfere with them. They came under their king Alboin (568), bringing fragments of other tribes with them. They occupied northern Italy, and Pavia became their capital. They then moved to the south, and, after overrunning a large part of Italy, established the duchies of Benevento and Spoleto. Alboin was soon murdered, and a leader named Cleph was made king. Cleph ruled less than a year, meeting with the same fate as his predecessor. For about ten years the Lombards, broken up into bands and groups, each under a duke,<sup>1</sup> existed without a king. The idea of kingship was not yet thoroughly developed among them, and they felt that a king was not necessary to their existence. They consequently reverted to the forms of government which they had had before entering the empire. It is said that there were thirty-five such dukes reigning among them at one time. They were surrounded by enemies, and their divided condition was a cause of great weakness. About 580 they became convinced that they needed a king and elected Authari; but the dukes had already become too powerful, and Authari was never completely master. The duchies of Benevento and Spoleto were only nominally subject to him. The territory thus wrested from the empire was firmly held, but the Lombards could not conquer all Italy. Ravenna, the extreme southern part, and the duchy of Rome<sup>1</sup> still remained in the hands of the emperor. Unlike all the other Germans, many of the Lombards settled in the cities and towns. Their urban residence undoubtedly had much to do with the early development of the Italian cities, the medieval grandeur of which was due, in part at least, to the German blood of their citizens.

<sup>1</sup> In later Roman times the Dux acted as civil governor of the Roman territory in Italy under the ex-arch of Ravenna.

## CHAPTER III

### THE FRANKS, 481-814

- LITERATURE —Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*  
Henderson, *History of Germany in the Middle Ages*  
*The Student's History of France*  
Kitchin, *History of France*  
Menzel, *History of Germany*, Vol. I 3 Vols  
Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*  
Church, *The Beginnings of the Middle Ages*  
Emerton, *Introduction to Study of the Middle Ages*  
Thatcher and Schwill, *Europe in the Middle Ages*.  
Guizot, *The History of Civilization*  
Hodgkin, *Charles the Great*  
Davis, *Charlemagne*  
Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great*.  
Mombert, *Charles the Great*  
Wells, *Age of Charlemagne*  
Fisher, *Medieval Empire*  
West, *Alcuin*

IN 481 Chlodwig became king of a small tribe of Salian Franks, who had settled near the Scheldt and the Meuse. By force or fraud he overcame, one after another, all the petty kings about him, and slowly gathered the many Frankish tribes under his sceptre. His first important victory was gained over Syagrius, a Roman official, who was then governing a large district between the Loire and the Seine. Chlodwig took possession of the territory thus conquered and so extended his power to the Loire (486). In 496 he conquered the Alamanni, and in consequence of his victory accepted the orthodox form of Christianity and was baptized with a large number of his people. The bishop of Rheims, who performed the rite, addressed him as a second Constantine, and told him it was his duty to protect, defend, and extend the Church. This

*Consolidation of the Franks by Chlodwig*

486 A.D

*Conquest of the Alamanni, 496.*



conversion of Chlodwig and the Franks to the orthodox faith was the foundation and beginning of the famous alliance between the bishops of Rome and the Frankish kings, which, with interruptions, lasted for centuries, and profoundly modified the course of events.

Chlodwig continued his conquests by depriving the West Goths of nearly all their territory north of the Pyrenees.

*The Frankish kingdom divided.* When he died, in 511, he divided his kingdom among his four sons, who, in spite of frequent civil wars, were able to extend their boundaries. In

531 Thuringia was acquired; in 534 Burgundy was added to their possessions; and in 555 Bavaria was reduced to subjection. All this territory was united under

Chlothar (558-61), only to be again divided among his four sons at his death, but neither was this division permanent. The Franks in the west were slowly yielding to Roman influences, and were becoming separated from the Franks in the east, who still remained more thoroughly German and warlike. The fact that the two districts were under different kings, who were for many years hostile to each other, helped to increase and perpetuate the differences between them, so that they received different names and were regarded as

*Austrasia and Neustria* different kingdoms. The eastern part was called Austrasia, and the western Neustria. During the

last half of the sixth century these two kingdoms were disturbed by civil wars, the leading spirits in which were the rival queens Fredegonda and Brunhilda.

Since the days of Chlodwig an important office had been developed at the court of the Frankish kings. As the king grew in power and importance, his household increased accordingly. Over this household he placed a chief servant, called *major domus*, or mayor of the palace, who was responsible for its management. This office, at first servile,

*The major domus.* soon took on a political character. The *major domus* always had the ear of the king; all access to the king was through him; his influence therefore became great. Gradually he became the king's intimate adviser, and

the original character of his office disappeared. It must be noted, too, that there was a *major domus* in each kingdom. The nobles early tried to control the appointment of the *major domus*, unsuccessfully, however, till a mere child succeeded to the throne of Austrasia, when the nobles got possession of the boy and appointed one of their own number *major domus* and regent. Since the king was a child, the *major domus* had every opportunity to increase his own power, and the king was never again his own master.

*The nobility obtains control of the office.*

Dagobert, who was king over all the Franks (628-38), was the last to enjoy any great amount of independent authority. After him there came the "do-nothing kings," who had no share in the government and were kept

*Dagobert.*

only as figure-heads. The *major domus* exercised royal authority without having the royal name. At the death of Dagobert the office of *major domus* in Austrasia became hereditary in the family of Pippin the Elder. This Pippin was the lord of two estates, known as Landen and Heristhal. Arnulf, bishop of Metz, was married, as were many of the clergy of that day, and his son Ansegisil married the daughter of Pippin. From this union sprang the line known (from their most splendid representative, Karl the Great) as the Karlings. Pippin passed his office of *major domus* on to his son Grimoald, who lost his life in an attempt to usurp the title of king for his son. The people were still too much attached to their royal house, and the nobles were too jealous of Grimoald, to permit this change.

*Union of the families of Pippin and Arnulf.*

Pippin the Younger, or Pippin of Heristhal, as he is called, seized the office of *major domus* and practically ruled Austrasia. After a long war he made himself master of Neustria also (687-714), thus ruling over the whole Frankland. He began a policy which was to be followed by his successors and to bear its legitimate fruit in the kingdom of Karl the Great. He strove to consolidate his vast territories; to bring them under one central government; to render this government as nearly

*Pippin of Heristhal major-domus (687-714).*

absolute as possible, and to make the people of his kingdom *Karl Martel* homogeneous. His son, Karl Martel, who succeeded him (714-41), continued this work. His reign was full of wars, because, whenever an opportunity was given, some part of the kingdom revolted. One after another, the Frisians, the Neustrians, the Thuringians, the Bavarians, the Alamanni, and the people of Aquitaine rebelled, only to be put down by arms. The Mohammedans invaded Frankland from Spain (720), but *The battle of Tours* (732). Karl Martel met them at Tours and broke their powers so completely (732) that they were never able to establish themselves north of the Pyrenees.

Before Karl Martel died he divided the power between his two sons, Karlman and Pippin. The brothers ruled together harmoniously till Karlman resigned and went into a monastery, leaving Pippin sole *major domus*. *Pippin becomes king* (751). Deeming that the time was now ripe, Pippin laid his plans for obtaining the royal title. He sent an embassy to Rome to ask pope Zacharias who should be king: the one who had the title without the power, or the one who had the power without the title. The pope, who was looking abroad for an ally, replied that it seemed to him that the one who had the power should also be king, and acting on this, Pippin called an assembly of his nobles at Soissons (751), deposed the last phantom king of the Merovingian line of Frankish kings founded by Chlodwig, and was himself elected and anointed king.

Pippin's invasions of Lombardy and his service to the oppressed papacy will be described later. Before *Karl the Great* (768-814). his death (768) he divided his kingdom between his two sons, Karlman and Karl—bitter enemies—and civil war was averted only by the death of Karlman (771).

The quarrel between the pope and the Lombards broke out again, and as Karl had a private grudge against the latter, *Karl conquers the Lombards* he was easily persuaded to interfere on behalf of the pope. He invaded Lombardy, conquered its king, Desiderius, and made himself king of the Lombards, and renewed his father's gift to the pope. The

conquest of the Lombards was of great importance because it brought Karl into close relations with Italy and the papacy.

Equally important for other reasons was the subjugation of the Saxons. For more than thirty years (772-804) Karl was engaged in fighting them. Year after year he *The Saxon wars.* overran their territory and received their submission and their promise to accept Christianity, but as soon as he withdrew his army they would revolt, destroy the churches, slay the Christian priests, and revert to heathenism. But Karl eventually wore them out, and they submitted to his rule. He divided the land into bishoprics and established bishops at Minden, Paderborn, Verden, Bremen, Osnabruck, and Halberstadt. These places quickly grew into towns and became centres of life and civilization, connected by roads made to facilitate travel and trade.

Karl's reign was one long campaign. Revolts in Bavaria called him into that duchy, and in 787 he removed its duke and placed it under counts of his own appointment.<sup>1</sup> It required several campaigns to destroy *Karl's other conquests* the kingdom of the Avars on the middle Danube. The Slavs between the Elbe and the Oder were subjugated by Karl, and Bohemia was compelled to pay him tribute. Toward the end of his reign the Norsemen troubled the northern frontier. The Mohammedans in Spain Karl drove beyond the Ebro, and his fleets contended with the naval forces of the Mohammedans on the Mediterranean Sea for the possession of Sardinia, Corsica, and other islands. In the south of Italy his troops even came into conflict with the army of the Greek emperor, but there was little fighting between them. Fortunate in all his wars, Karl succeeded in extending his boundaries in all directions. It was this series of splendid conquests which laid the foundations for the renewal of the empire and the imperial title in the west.

<sup>1</sup> The Count (Comes) represented the Frankish element in the cities. He was both a military and civil official. Under the Merovingians and Carolingians the kingdom was divided into countships. Several of these were often united under a single official of higher rank—a Dux. See p. 38 *note.*

The west, as we have seen, had for a long time ~~seen~~ practically separated from the empire. Yet the idea still prevailed that there must be an empire; that it was *The idea of a world empire.* necessary to the existing order of things, that without an empire the world could not stand, and that, in fact, the west was still a part of the empire. The Church had striven to become universal, and by insisting on ecclesiastical unity had helped keep alive the idea of political unity. The bishops of Rome had recognised the emperor at Constantinople as their lord; but during the eighth century a quarrel had arisen, and the popes had thrown off their allegiance and were looking for a protector elsewhere. The great power of the Frankish kingdom and its close alliance with the bishops of Rome were the conditions which rendered the revival of the empire in the west possible.

There was in Rome a party which was labouring for the independence of Rome and the revival of her ancient power.

*The republican party in Rome.* They were beginning to dream the dreams which troubled the Middle Age so much, dreams about restoring the Rome of the ancient republic, and making her once more the head of the world. In their way, however, was the pope, who was trying to govern Rome in a more or less autocratic manner. In 798 this party organized a revolt, maltreated Leo III., preferred charges of perjury and adultery against him, and drove him from Rome. He fled to Karl the Great and begged to be restored. Karl sent him back to Rome under the protection of his officials, and himself followed later. After Leo took an oath that he was innocent of the crimes with which he was charged, Karl

reinstated him in his office. Then, on Christmas Day, 800, while Karl was kneeling in the church of St Peter at Rome, the pope, without a word of warning, placed the imperial crown on his head and did him reverence; and all the people present shouted and hailed him emperor. Karl was taken by surprise. He was indeed striving to obtain the crown, but he wished to get it in a legitimate way, either by marrying Irene, empress in the east, or by

*Coronation of Karl (800).*

getting her to recognize him as her colleague and emperor in the west. He was, in fact, turning both plans over in his mind when his coronation by the pope forestalled him and cut across his plans, and, worst of all, made him in his own eyes a usurper. He knew that the pope had no legal right to give him the crown. It was an act of open rebellion against the emperor at Constantinople, although one for which the pope thought he had good and sufficient grounds. The emperors had for many years not done their duty to the western Church, and especially to the popes. By force of circumstances the emperor was limited in his activities almost wholly to the east, while the pope's interests and authority were limited to the west. Whenever the emperor had interfered in the west, it had generally been to the disadvantage of the pope, small wonder, then, that he was ready to revolt and transfer his allegiance to another. Added to this was the fact that the east was smirched with the heresy of hostility to the use of images. The west was shocked, too, that for the first time in its history the throne was held by a woman, and not only was the sovereign a woman, she was also guilty of inhuman cruelty, for she had deposed, imprisoned, and blinded her son, Constantine VI. This action of the pope also fell in with the prevailing desire of the people of Rome to restore their city to the place of honour which she had once had, but which was now held by Constantinople.

There were good reasons why Karl should be elevated to this high position. By conquest he had built up an empire which included all the west of Europe; he had in certain directions even extended the boundary of the empire, and had everywhere established, protected, and promoted the Church, and preserved order and peace; he was, therefore, the only possible candidate the west had to offer. The pope had also a selfish motive. His position in Rome was no longer sure. The republican party in the city had driven him out once, and would do so again if the opportunity were offered. The

*Grounds for the revolt.*

*Karl the only candidate in the west.*

pope knew that he could hold his place in Rome only with the aid of Karl. By being crowned emperor, Karl was made responsible for the preservation of peace and order in Rome. The pope could therefore hope for Karl's support and protection, since the emperor would not tolerate the independence of Rome nor allow the principal bishop in the west to be driven from his place.

Karl's surprise and displeasure were great, but he did not refuse the crown. He assumed the title, but at the same time began negotiations with Constantinople, looking toward the confirmation of his newly-acquired honour. But the emperors in the east were for a long time inexorable; they refused him all recognition and heaped insults upon him. Karl, however, preserved a conciliatory attitude, and finally obtained what he so earnestly desired. In 812 he was greeted as "Imperator" and "Basileus" by the ambassadors of the eastern court. The defect in his title was thereby removed, and Karl troubled himself no further about Constantinople.

The coronation of Karl was, as has been said, a rebellious, and therefore an illegal, act. Although Karl continued to recognize the existence of the emperors at Constantinople, the people in the west believed that they were deposing the eastern line and restoring the supremacy of the west. In their lists of emperors the name of Karl directly follows that of Constantine VI. It was, and they meant that it should be, a revolt. At the time there was no attempt made to give a legal explanation of it, or to make any theory about it; but later three legal theories were advanced by different parties, each of which wished to make capital out of the event. The imperial party declared that Karl had won the crown by his conquests, and was indebted to no one for it but himself. This theory was based on truth, for Karl had conquered great territories, and but for this would not have been even thought of for emperor. The papal party said that the pope, by virtue of his power as successor of the Apostle

Peter, had deposed the emperor at Constantinople and conferred the crown on Karl. This was based on the fact that the pope actually crowned Karl, but at that time no one supposed for a moment that the pope was crowning him by virtue of any such power. Such an interpretation was not thought of till long after. The people of Rome also advanced a theory to the effect that they had elected Karl, and that they had revived their ancient right of electing the emperor. This theory had in its favour little more than the fact that the people had sanctioned the action of their leader by their shouts and acclamations.

Such was the famous restoration of the empire in the west, a most important act, because of the great influence it had on the later history. It bound Italy and Germany together in a union which, while it had its compensations, was, on the whole, ruinous to both, at least politically. In consequence of this coronation of Karl, for seven hundred years the German emperors were unable to free themselves from the idea that they must rule Italy, and they continually wasted their strength in useless campaigns in Italy, instead of extending Germany to the east, the only direction in which there was possibility of success. They wore themselves out in Italy, but were never able to unite Germany. The best days of her best emperors were spent on Italian soil, and the political unification of Germany was made impossible until our own times.

The coronation of Karl greatly increased his prestige, and, indirectly, his power. "Emperor" was far more than "king," and brought with it many more duties and obligations. Karl regarded himself as much exalted by the new office. The emperor was supposed to hold his office directly from God, to whom alone he was responsible for everything he did. This is apparent from some of Karl's measures for governing. Shortly after his coronation he compelled all his subjects to take a special oath to himself as emperor, the peculiarity of which was that all were required to swear that they would live not only as

*Effects of  
the restoration.*

*Karl's conception of  
his office.*



good citizens, but also as good Christians. The emperor assumed responsibility for the Christian living of his subjects.

For carrying on the government of his vast territory Karl had to invent new forms and adapt old ones. He held "may-Karl's gov- fields," according to the old German custom, but it ernment. was impossible for all his subjects to attend them.

Large numbers of them came, however, especially because the campaigns were planned in these meetings, and it was expected that the armies would proceed at once to the war.

He divided his territory into counties and placed Counts. over each a count.<sup>1</sup> In the west the cities with

the surrounding country formed these counties; in the east they were formed by the old tribal boundaries, while on the frontiers new districts were organized (marches or *Markgrafschafte*n) and placed under border counts. The counts were responsible for the administration of government in their counties.

The dukes and duchies of Aquitaine, Alamannia, Saxony, Dukes dis- and Bavaria disappeared, because they were too appear. strong a menace to the unity of the empire. Only the dukes of Benevento, Brittany, and Gascony remained, and they were simply Karl's officers and not independent.

In order to put a check on all the officers of his realm, and to control them, Karl sent out special commissioners, called Missi Dom- "Missi Dominici," or royal messengers, whose duty inci. it was to oversee all that was done by the local

officers. They were to inquire into the conduct of all officials, and of the clergy as well. Appeals were made to them, and any misconduct on the part of any officer was reported to them. They were generally sent out in twos, one of them being a clergyman. They looked after the condition of the army, the collection of the taxes, the state of the churches and schools, the morals of the clergy, and the administration of justice as well as of things in general. In this way Karl was kept fully conversant with the affairs of both Church and state throughout his kingdom. The clergy were also regarded as officers of the state, and they had certain civil duties. They

<sup>1</sup> See pp 38 and 43, note.

and the counts were supposed to work together in harmony, and mutually to assist each other; but there were at bottom the same unsettled relations between the clergy and the counts as between the emperor and the pope; the authority, rights, and duties of each were not clearly defined.

Karl himself by his own personal efforts gave unity to the government and did much of the actual work of governing. He was busy moving from one part of the realm to another, fighting, administering justice, conducting trials, settling difficulties, and, in general, keeping the machinery of government in motion. *Karl's personal government.*

His military system did not differ from that of his predecessors. At his summons all his free subjects were supposed to come prepared to begin a campaign. But the frequency of his wars and their great distance from home made them very burdensome, and many began to try to escape military service. A compromise was effected by which a certain number of men were allowed to equip one man and send him as their representative. Karl also built a fleet to guard the coast, and especially the mouths of rivers, which latter he often fortified. *His military system.*

As a lawgiver he was also active, although there is little that is remarkable in his legislation. He tried to preserve the old German laws and customs, which he caused to be reduced to writing. His own laws are a curious mixture of German, Roman, and biblical elements. Since his empire was Christian, the Bible was the very highest authority, and all laws were to be in harmony with it. It did indeed colour much of his legislation. *Karl as lawgiver.*

As a builder Karl achieved a great reputation. He built many churches, the principal one of which was the church of St Mary at Aachen. He built a great palace for himself at Aachen, another at Ingelheim, near Mainz, and another at Nimuëgen. He also built a bridge over the Rhine at Mainz, but it was destroyed by fire before his death. His architects were mostly Italians. Many pillars and other building materials were brought from Italy at incredible *As builder.*

expense and labour. The style of his architecture was undoubtedly a derived Byzantine, for the buildings of Ravenna were his models.

Probably the most remarkable of all Karl's activities was his educational work. He drew to his court some of the most learned men of his day, among them Alcuin, Paulus Diaconus, and Peter of Pisa. He formed his court into a palace school (*scola palatina*), all the members of which assumed either classical or biblical names. Karl called himself David. The sessions of this school were held mostly in the winter, because in the summer Karl was engaged in his wars. His learned men gave lectures, and there were many discussions of the subjects broached. The clergy of the empire were, on the whole, very ignorant, many of them too ignorant to preach, and Karl caused a volume of sermons to be prepared for their use. He established cathedral schools, the most prominent of which were at Rheims and Orléans, and monastery schools, such as those of St Gall, Tours, Reichenau, Fulda, Hersfeld, and Corvey. These were especially for the education of the clergy, but they were open to laymen as well. In fact, Karl had thoughts of a state system of public instruction. He established two schools of music, one at Metz, the other at Soissons, and asked the pope to send him priests who could give instruction in the style of singing practised in Italy.

Among the many stories about Karl, which the monk of St Gall collected, is one that shows the interest which Karl took in the work of the schools. Returning to Aachen after a long absence, Karl ordered all the scholars to show him the results of their studies. The sons of the high nobility were unable to produce any proofs of their industry, while those of common birth laid before him many of their compositions in the form of letters, poems, and other documents, all well composed according to the models then in vogue. Karl thundered out his displeasure at the idle ones, rebuking them for their trust in their high birth, and for spend-

*Karl's interest in his schools*

*Monk of St Gall, The Deeds of Karl the Great, I., 3.*

ing their time in sports and in idleness. He warned them that if they continued in this course they need never expect any gifts or preferment from him. The others he commended for their industry and obedience, and urged them to labour to perfect their education, promising to hold all such in high honour and to reward them with good bishoprics and abbeys.

This manifold activity amounted to a real revival of learning, which bore fruit in the ninth century in the great disputations about fore-ordination and transubstantiation, as well as in the literature of that period. The great emphasis placed on classical Latin had some very important effects. In the first place, it purified the Latin of the Church, but at the same time widened the chasm between the spoken and the written Latin. The spoken Latin had now become a dialect, very different from the written language. This vulgar speech was the beginning of the French language, and its development and use as a literary language were hastened by the revival of classical Latin. The interest in the classics led to the multiplication of manuscripts and the preservation of the works of Latin authors which would otherwise have perished, and it also determined that the Latin should be the language of education during the Middle Age.

Karl also loved his own tongue, the German. He caused a grammar of it to be made, attempting thus to make of it a literary language by reducing it to regular forms. He made a collection of the German songs and legends which were probably the earliest forms of some of the stories in the "Nibelungen Lied," but his son Ludwig, to our great loss, had this destroyed because of its heathenism.

The attitude of Karl to the Church has already been shown. He regarded it as his special duty to defend the Church and to extend it by converting the heathen. The motive of many of his wars was quite as much religious as political. He took care that the conquered lands should be supplied with churches and clergy. He regarded himself as

*Effects of  
this "Re-  
vival of  
Learning"*

*Karl a Ger-  
man.*

*Karl and the  
Church.*

the master of the Church by virtue of the office which he held. He controlled the election of bishops and archbishops, and sometimes even appointed them. The organization of the Church, begun in a systematic way by Boniface, was completed by him. He exercised the right of calling ecclesiastical councils, presided over them, and signed the decrees, which would otherwise have been invalid. Under him the Church had no independent power of legislation. The clergy, as well as the laymen, were subject to the laws of the empire. Karl was the first to make the payment of tithes obligatory. During the first seven centuries of the Church, the tithe was practically unknown, being at that time only the traditional and customary rent paid for the use of lands. Karl tried to make this payment binding on the lands which he conquered, especially on the Saxons. This tenth, being paid for the support of the Church, brought about a change in the conception of tithing. It was then identified with the tithe of the Old Testament, and in time made compulsory throughout all Christian countries.

But Karl's authority over the Church extended still further. He claimed the right to determine the polity, ritual, and even the doctrines of the Church. In 787 the empress Irene called a council to meet at Nicæa which should settle the question of the use of images in the churches. This council, under the protection of Irene, declared in favour of their use, and sent its decrees or decisions to pope Hadrian (772-95). *Karl and the Pope.* Hadrian, however, who had all the time favoured the use of images, was pleased with the decisions, sanctioned them, and sent them to Karl, asking that they be published. But Karl was of a different opinion, and calling a council of his bishops, in 794, caused the action of the council at Nicæa to be refuted. The refutation (the *Libri Carolini*) was sent to pope Hadrian with a reprimand, and a command that in the future he should wait in all such matters until Karl had given his consent. In another letter he reminded the pope that it was his special duty to pray, and not to interfere in the affairs of the state, which belonged to the emperor alone. Karl un-

doubtedly was, and was regarded, as the highest authority in the west, distinctly superior to the pope in all political matters, and practically so in ecclesiastical affairs. There was no legal determination of the mutual relations and powers of the emperor and the pope, for the theoretical question was not yet broached. Both emperor and pope made claims which were mutually opposed and conflicting, but there was no theoretical treatment of the question of their respective rights and authorities. The pope claimed to be the successor of St Peter, the bishop of the whole Church, and therefore he must have authority over the whole Church; but Karl was the Christian emperor, the ruler of the world with absolute authority. The adjustment of these claims was not to be reached till after centuries of struggle for supremacy.

In Karl is found that peculiar fusion of German, Roman, and biblical elements which characterizes the Middle Age. In his dress, speech, manners, and sympathies he was a German, but judging him by his notions and practice of government he was a Roman, largely affected by biblical conceptions and ideas. He was a Roman emperor who attempted to establish a theocracy. He was absolute master of the west, and his reputation was so great that his friendship was sought even by the great khalif, Haroun-al-Raschid, of Bagdad, who wished to see his rebellious Saracen subjects of Spain punished.

His counsellor and private secretary, Einhard, has left us a lively picture of Karl. Without doubt he was one of the greatest men of all time. No one has ever more *Einhard's* thoroughly taken hold of the imagination of the *Biography*. people. For centuries after his death the popular imagination was busy with his name and deeds, and the impression which he made on the world found expression in a vast cycle of legends, all of which were confidently believed during the Middle Ages.

He died January 28, 814, at Aachen, from pleurisy, and was buried the same day in the great church which he had built. "A gilded arch was erected above his tomb, with his

image and an inscription. The words of the inscription were as follows: 'In this tomb, lies the body of Karl the Great and Orthodox Emperor, who gloriously extended the kingdom of the Franks and reigned prosperously for forty-seven years. He died at the age of seventy, in the year of our Lord 814, on the 28th day of January.'"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Einhard, p. 71.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE DISMEMBERMENT OF THE EMPIRE

LITERATURE.—Emerton, *Medieval Europe*.

Oman, *The Dark Ages*, 476-918 See also the lists in Chaps I and III.

KARL had indeed acquired a vast empire and by his great personal ability governed it well. But he could not in so short a time make the various peoples who composed his realm homogeneous. A common religious faith and a common government were not sufficient to overcome the differences which existed in race, tribe, temperament, customs, and language. As soon, therefore, as Karl's commanding personality was removed, these differences began to reassert themselves. Karl had made a brilliant attempt to reorganize society after the model of the Roman empire. He failed, and his kingdom went to pieces, partly because of the weakness of his successors, under whom lands, office, and authority were usurped by their officials.

*Causes of  
disintegration.*

Another cause of dismemberment was the actual partition of the empire among the sons in the royal family, the empire being regarded as a private possession and divided among the heirs. The disintegration was further brought about by the racial differences that existed in the realm, and by the forces set in operation by the invasion of the barbarians. The Germans were intensely ambitious and proud. Individualism was one of their most prominent characteristics. In the then existing state of society the only legitimate exercise of ability and ambition was in the practice of arms. Since this was the only way to rise, it is not surprising that we should now come upon a period of violence and lawlessness in which might determined everything. Although Karl's



realm went to pieces, during his reign its various parts had all been subjected to influences which modified their future.

The dissolution of the empire made rapid strides under Karl's son, Ludwig the Pious (814-40), a prince who lacked *Ludwig the Pious.* all the qualities which made his father great. His education had been intrusted to the clergy, with

most unfortunate results. He was better fitted for the monastery than the throne, and more than once actually wished to lay down his crown and enter the cloister. His conscience was abnormally developed and thoroughly morbid. He magnified his petty faults into great sins, and was continually doing penance for them when he should have been attending to the affairs of state. He altogether lacked the sterner qualities necessary for governing in a time of violence and barbarism. Without will or purpose he was in turn the slave of his wife, his clergy, and his sons. Karl the Great,

*His three-fold coronation.* about six months before his death, had crowned Ludwig as his successor. On his accession Ludwig repeated the coronation, placing the crown upon

his own head. In 815 pope Leo III. died, and the people of Rome elected his successor, Stephen IV., without asking the consent or sanction of Ludwig, an insult and infringement of his prerogatives which the emperor did not resent. The pope followed up the advantage thus gained, and told the emperor that his coronation was invalid because it had not been performed by the clergy, and proposed to come into France and recrown him. Again Ludwig yielded, and was crowned a third time by Stephen IV., at Rheims (816-17). Another precedent was thereby established for the claim made by the popes that they alone had the right to crown the emperor.

The reign of Ludwig was full of stupid blunders. In his zeal for reform he drove from his court the able counsellors *Ludwig's blunders.* of Karl the Great, because their lives did not seem to him sufficiently ascetic. He released nearly

all the monasteries of his realm from all duties to the state except that of praying for the welfare of the emperor, his children, and the state, thus depriving the crown of a large

income, and fostering in the Church the idea of separation and independence. He closed the monastery schools to the laity, was lavish in his gifts to both monasteries and churches, and was always surrounded by monks and priests. In 817 he committed the unpardonable blunder of dividing his empire among his three sons and associating them with himself in the government. The division led to jealousies, intrigues, and war. Instead of boldly facing the problems and difficulties that beset him, Ludwig spent his time in doing penance, and offended against the dignity of his office by appearing in the garb of a penitent before a great council of the clergy and nobility, and making humble confession of imaginary sins. Yielding to the importunities of Judith, his second wife, he deprived two of his sons by his first wife of some of their territory in order to make a principality for his youngest son, Charles. Revolt and war were the result, and the last years of his life were filled with the most disgraceful intrigues and treachery.

A new division of his realm was several times attempted, either in the interest of his favourite, Charles, or in the hope that all the sons might be satisfied. It was all in vain, however, for when Ludwig died (840) the three sons who survived him continued their fratricidal wars for three years before they could agree upon any division of the territory. Finally, the brothers came together and settled their long quarrel by the treaty of Verdun (843).

According to the terms of this treaty, Lothar retained the imperial crown. As emperor he must have the two capitals, Rome and Aachen. He therefore received Italy *The treaty of Verdun, 843* and a strip of land extending from Italy to the North Sea. This strip was bounded on the east by the Rhine, but at Bonn the line left the river and ran north to the mouth of the Weser. The western boundary line began some miles west of the mouth of the Rhône, but joined that river near Lyons; it then followed the Rhône and the Saône to the source of the latter; thence to the source of the Meuse, which seems to have formed the boundary as far as the

**Ardennes** The line then ran to the Scheldt, which it followed to its mouth. Charles, surnamed the Bald, received all the territory west of this strip. Ludwig, called the German, obtained all the land to the east, with the dioceses of Mainz, Worms, and Speier, which lay west of the Rhine.

Charles and Ludwig had the best of it in this division, because their territory was compact and each was ruler of a single nationality. The subjects of Ludwig were all German, while those of Charles were mixed, indeed, but becoming homogeneous. The German element was being assimilated by the Keltic.

*The beginning of France and Germany.*

The history of Germany and of France as separate nations begins with 843. But Lothar's subjects were of many nationalities. Besides, his territory lay in such a way that it could not easily be defended. It is significant that his kingdom could be named only after himself and not after any people. It was known as the kingdom of Lothar, while Charles was called king of the Franks, and Ludwig king of the Germans. Geographically and racially it was impossible that the kingdom of Lothar should hold together. The Alps broke it into two parts; Italy might perhaps be made into a nation, but the narrow strip along the Rhine, from the Alps to the North Sea, was fated to be broken into many fragments and fought over for centuries by the French and the Germans.

Lothar was powerless against the violence that prevailed during the ninth century, and, worn out, divided his territory among his three sons and withdrew into a monastery, where

*The family of Lothar becomes extinct; his kingdom divided.*

he soon afterward died (855). His eldest son, known as Ludwig II., received Italy and the imperial title; Charles's portion was Provence and Burgundy; while Lothar II. obtained Frisia, Austrasia, and all the remaining lands north of the Alps. From him this territory took the name of Lotharingia (Lorraine). The three brothers could not, however, live together in peace. They were in constant feud with each other till 863, when Charles died, and the other two divided his territory between them. In 869 Lothar II.

died, and his uncles, Charles the Bald, king of the West Franks, and Ludwig the German, after some struggle, divided his land. In 875 the emperor, Ludwig II., died, and with his death this branch of the family became extinct. The rivalry between Charles the Bald and Ludwig the German culminated in a war for the possession of the imperial crown. Charles was the first to reach Italy, and was crowned at Pavia king of the Lombards, and a short time afterward emperor, by the pope at Rome.

*Charles the Bald becomes emperor 875.*

Ludwig the German was unable to take the field in person against his brother. He was old and feeble, and death overtook him the next year (876). His long reign, although greatly disturbed by the revolts of his sons and the invasions of the Northmen and Slavs was, on the whole, fairly successful. It was of the highest importance that the various German tribes should be brought to feel their unity and that a national feeling should be produced among them. It was during his reign that the East Franks (Franconians), Saxons, Suabians, and Bavarians came to feel that they were much alike, and that they differed from the Franks of the west. He extended his boundaries by chastising and reducing the rebellious Slavic peoples to the north-east, and a great many of the Bohemian and Moravian tribes. He was successful in punishing the Northmen and resisted their invasions, although he could not prevent the destruction of Hamburg, which Ludwig the Pious had made the seat of an archbishop. Regarding the kingship as his private property, Ludwig the German divided his kingdom among his three sons; but Karlman died in 880, and Ludwig, known as the Saxon, in 884, leaving as sole ruler their brother, Karl the Fat, who had been crowned emperor by the pope in 882.

*The reign of Ludwig the German.*

At the death of Ludwig the German (876), Charles the Bald, true to his character, tried to seize his territory, but was unable to do so. At the same time the Northmen invaded his kingdom. Without trying to meet them in the field, he bribed them to attack his nephews, and set off for Italy because he thought

*Charles the Bald, 840-77.*

his imperial crown endangered by a revolt there. He died, however, on the journey, at the foot of the Mont Cenis pass. The favourite son of his father, he had been the cause of the wars that filled the last years of Ludwig the Pious. Ambitious and grasping, he had begun several wars during his reign for the purpose of unjustly depriving some of his relatives of their possessions. In striving to extend his territory, he neglected what he already possessed. His officials ruled as they pleased, and the Northmen and Saracens ravaged his territory almost unhindered. He did little more than squander the resources of his kingdom. His son, Louis II. the Stammerer, succeeded him; but after a short, though promising, reign died (879), leaving two sons, Louis III. and Karlman, and a posthumous son, afterward known as Charles the Simple. The death of Louis III. (882) and of Karlman (884) practically left the throne vacant, since Charles the Simple was only five years

*The whole  
empire re-  
united under  
Karl the  
Fat, emperor,  
884-87.*

old. Rather than trust to a mere child, the nobles offered the crown to Karl the Fat, who, by accepting it, united under himself all the territory which had once been ruled over by Karl the Great. He was, however, not equal to the task. Besides being very corpulent he was afflicted with chronic headache, which incapacitated him for both thought

*The seven  
little king-  
doms.  
Germany.  
Two king-  
doms in  
France.*

and action. His inefficiency led to his deposition (887), and the empire rapidly broke up into small kingdoms. His nephew, Arnulf, who deposed him, received as his reward the kingdom of the East Franks, the nobles of the West Franks elected Odo, count of Paris, king, while the duke

of Aquitaine took Charles the Simple to his court and remained independent of Odo. Burgundy was divided into two kingdoms. In 879 count Boso, of Vienne, had usurped

*The two  
Burgundies.*

the royal title and made himself master of lower Burgundy. Count Rudolf now seized upper Burgundy and succeeded in getting himself crowned king. His territory was bounded approximately by the Saône and by the Aar, and extended from Basel to Lyons. These two little

kingdoms remained separate till 934, when they united to form the kingdom of Burgundy or Arles. In Lombardy there were also two kingdoms formed. Berengar, margrave of Friuli, was elected king of the Lombards and crowned by the archbishop of Milan, but Guido of Spoleto made war on him, got possession of the western part of Lombardy, and assumed the title of king.

The breaking up of the empire into these little kingdoms shows how thoroughly power and authority had been dissipated and decentralized during the ninth century. Feudalism had got a strong hold on Europe. Offices and lands which had once been held at the will of the king had been usurped, and had become hereditary possessions of their holders. Violence was everywhere; the more powerful nobles oppressed the weaker, and all united to enslave the freemen. The chaos of the times was due to the weakness and inefficiency of the rulers, who, for the most part, neglected their first and most important duties to chase after the shadows of empty titles.

## CHAPTER V

### ENGLAND AND THE NORSEMEN (802-1070)

#### LITERATURE.—As in Chap. I. Also

Ramsay, *The Foundations of England*.

Sharon Turner, *History of the English Success*.

Freeman, *Short History of the Norman Conquest*, and *William the Conqueror*.

Green, *Conquest of England*.

*Saxon Chronicles*, edited by Plummer and Earle.

Church, *Life of Anselm*

*Lives of Alfred the Great*, by Pauli, Asser, and Hughes.

Johnson, *The Normans in Europe*

THE struggle for supremacy, which lasted for three hundred years, among the small kingdoms of England, was practically ended during the reign of Ecgberht, who ascended the throne of Wessex in 802. Northumbria and Mercia, the two great rivals of Wessex, were worn out with the long wars, so that Ecgberht found it comparatively easy to make himself the overlord of all the country. He had spent thirteen years in exile at the court of Karl the Great, and had no doubt learned much and had his ambitions quickened by what he saw of the successes of the great Frankish king. In his government Ecgberht showed wise consideration, and while recognizing to a certain extent the various political divisions of the country, he drew the bonds closer which connected them with Wessex.

The supremacy which Wessex now enjoyed might have been as ephemeral as that of the other kingdoms but for the fact that for nearly one hundred and fifty years after Ecgberht its throne was occupied by able kings who wisely secured the assistance of the clergy in all that they did. The fusion of the

kingdoms into one people was also hastened by the great common danger which threatened them from the Northmen. As early as 787 the eastern coast of England had been attacked by pirates from the continent. Their ravages became more and more frequent, and the king found it difficult to defeat them or to derive any solid advantage from a victory over them. During the reign of Ecgberrht they harried all the country incessantly. His son and successor, Aethelwulf (839-58), was unable to stem the tide of invasion. In 851 they were bold enough to spend the winter on the island of Thanet.

*Invasions of  
the North-  
men.*

Aethelwulf was succeeded by his four sons in the order of their age. Aethelbald (858-60), Aethelberht (860-66), Aethelred (866-71), and Aelfred the Great (871-899). The task of defending the country against these barbarian invaders became more difficult as greater numbers of them began to settle on the east coast. In 866 the Danes began the work of conquest and settlement in earnest. Northumbria was quickly overrun and subdued by them. East Anglia and the Fen were next attacked and conquered, their famous monasteries were burned, and the king of East Anglia, Eadmund, was slain. This king was later canonized, and over his remains was built the great abbey of St. Edmundsbury. Mercia was not yet attacked, but in 870 its king paid the Danes tribute and acknowledged their leader as overlord. This submission was due not only to fear of the Danes, but also to dislike of the West Saxon supremacy.

King Aethelred was left with only the territory south of the Thames, all north of that river being in the hands of the Danes. For some time it seemed that all England was to be conquered. The Danes pushed up the Thames and out into Wessex, and Aethelred was unable to drive them back. In the midst of the war he died, leaving his crown to his brother Aelfred, who tried in vain to repel the invaders. After several defeats, in which his army was destroyed, he was compelled to buy the withdrawal of the Danes, hoping that in the meantime he might be able to put

*Aelfred the  
Great,  
871-899.*



the country into a proper state of defence. Re-enforcements continued to come from Denmark and Scandinavia, and in 876, Guthrum, the Danish king of East Anglia, attacked Wessex. For two years the struggle was severe, but it ended in favour of Aelfred by the treaty of Wedmore (Chippenham) *Wedmore,* in 878; Guthrum accepted Christianity and was 878. ceded the eastern half of England north of the Thames. This territory was called the Danelaw. The conquerors settled as lords of the soil, and for a long time kept themselves separate from the conquered English. The fusion of the two peoples, however, came eventually.

During the remaining years of Aelfred's rule he had peace with the Danes, except in 886, when he was successful in wresting from them London and the surrounding districts, and again in 893, when he also successfully resisted their attacks. . The condition of his territory at the peace of Wedmore was wretched in the extreme. Churches and monasteries had been burned, the clergy slain or driven out, and law and order destroyed; everywhere there was great want and desolation. His first care was to train up an army to have it ready at his call. The country was divided into five districts, each of which was bound to furnish a certain number of men with provisions and equipment. Every town also was required to do the same. A part of the troops raised in this way were required to be ready to go whenever called, while the others were to remain at home as a guard. A threefold duty was laid on every landed proprietor; he must serve in the army, and contribute to the support of bridges and fortifications. Aelfred created a fleet which patrolled the coast and kept off the invaders. He restored order, punishing severely and impartially all offenders, and he enforced peace. The king's justice also began to take the place of the local justice. The king carefully controlled the decisions of the lower courts, and changed them if they were not according to his ideas. The independent legislation of Aelfred was probably not very great, but he had the laws of the Anglo-Saxon kings and

peoples collected and reduced to writing in the Anglo-Saxon language

Aelfred laboured to restore learning in his kingdom. Late in life he began the study of Latin, and mastered it so well that he was able to translate from it into his mother tongue. He surrounded himself with scholars, *Learning* most of whom he brought from the continent, and established a court school very much like that of Karl the Great. His own translations, however, were of most value to his people. From the Latin he translated the "Consolations of Philosophy," by Boethius, the "History of the World," by Orosius, the "Ecclesiastical History of the English," by the Venerable Bede, and the "Pastoral Rule," by Gregory the Great. It was under his direction, also, that the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" was compiled and continued. While all these works, except the latter, are translations, they contain also many additions from the pen of the king himself. Because of his moral greatness, and because of the fact that he regarded himself as the servant of his people, he has been given the well-earned title "Great."

The task that devolved on the successors of Aelfred was to prevent, if possible, any further migration from the continent, to reconquer the Danelaw, to hasten the fusion of the Danes with the English, and to keep down the tribal revolts and make England really one. Fortunately, his successors were able men (Eadward the Elder, 900-24, Aethelstan, 924-40; Eadmund, 940-46; Eadred, 946-55), who carried on the work well. Eadwig, however (955-59), was a mere boy, and his reign was troubled by quarrels among the nobles. But with the accession of Eadred (946) had come in a new power in the person of Dunstan, who was the first of that *Dunstan* line of remarkable ecclesiastical statesmen which England has produced. During a great part of the reigns of Eadred, Eadwig, Eadgar (959-75), Eadward the Martyr (975-79), and Aethelred the Redeless (979-1016), Dunstan (who died 988) was the power behind the throne. Commerce with the continent was fostered, order was preserved, and the

Church and monasteries thoroughly reformed. The old slavery was disappearing but in its stead the feudal rule was becoming established. The power of the king greatly increased, and he was looked upon as king of all England, and not simply of the West Saxons. The king now developed a court composed of his friends and officials, who formed a new nobility over against the old nobility of blood. The king took possession of the folkland, that is, the land which had been left for the common use, and enriched his servants by dividing up much of it among them. At the same time the *Folk moot*, the meeting of all the freemen, ceased, being replaced by the *Witenagemot*, the meeting of the wise men (*i.e.* the officials, with the highest clergy).

The reign of Aethelred the Redeless (*i.e.* without counsel) was very disastrous. Utterly incapable of ruling, he involved England more and more deeply in ruin and misery. In 991,

*Renewed  
Invasions of  
the Danes.* when the Danes began to invade England again, he bought a truce of them, and allowed them to settle in East Anglia. Other invasions followed,

led by Olaf of Norway and Swein of Denmark. Frightened at the danger which now threatened him, Aethelred tried to secure the assistance of Normandy by allying himself to its duke, whose sister, Emma, he married. Goaded to frenzy by the presence of the Danes who had recently come, the English planned to massacre them, and in 1002 they rose and put all the Danes among them to death. Among the slain was Gunhild, the sister of king Swein, who now swore to avenge her death by taking England from her king. From 1003 to 1007 his army overran England, plundering and burning

*Swein, the  
Dane, king  
of England* Aethelred bought a truce of him. Swein, however, went on preparing for a larger invasion, and in 1013 came back, and soon had all England in his power, while Aethelred was compelled to flee to Normandy.

But Swein's rule was of short duration. He died the next year, and the Danish warriors chose his son Knut as his successor. The death of Aethelred and his son Eadmund Ironside left Knut master of all England. He

reigned from 1016 to 1035 wisely and with a strong hand over his newly-acquired realm. Under him the old kingdoms lost more and more of their character as kingdoms, and became known as earldoms. He became a Christian in character as well as in name, and allied himself with the clergy. By renewing the laws of his predecessors and preserving English customs, he tried to make the people forget that he was a foreigner. He further strengthened his position by marrying Emma, the widow of Aethelred. He brought England peace; for, during his reign, the land was free from disturbances. Denmark, however, profited most by this conquest of England, for she was thereby brought into close contact with a nation far more civilized than herself, and her union with England greatly forwarded Christianity in all the countries of the north. The Danes differed from the people in England very little in blood, language, customs, and laws, and their settlement in England may be regarded as a re-enforcement of German blood and a strengthening of the English character.

At the death of Knut (1035) he was succeeded by his two sons in turn, Harold (1035-40) and Harthaknut (1040-42). They were, however, thoroughly barbarous and unfitted in every way to rule. England was again given up to violence, and as the people disliked them there was general joy when Harthaknut died and Eadward the Confessor (1042-66), son of Aethelred and Emma, came back from Normandy and was acknowledged as king. Tired of foreign rulers the people expected great things of Eadward, who was in blood an Englishman. But most of his life having been spent in Normandy, he was far more Norman than English. He returned with a large following of Normans, whom he placed in high offices, both secular and ecclesiastical, greatly to the disgust and anger of the people.

The real power in England, however, was in the hands of the great earl, Godwine of Wessex, whose earldom consisted of all the land south of the Thames. Eadward himself had little ability and less energy, and was content to pass his time in quiet. The two great earls of the

*The English line restored, 1042*

*Earl Godwine.*

north, Siward of Northumbria, and Leofric of Mercia, were kept so busy with the affairs of their earldoms, that Godwine had ample opportunity to carry out his plans. These were concerned with increasing the power of his own family. For his sons and other relatives he obtained small earldoms; and in 1045 he strengthened himself by giving his daughter Eadgyth to the king in marriage.

Owing to the jealousy of the other great earls and to a quarrel with the king Godwine withdrew to Flanders (1051). The next year, however, the English were glad to see him return, because the king had, in the meanwhile, shown even greater favour to the Normans. In 1051 William the Bastard, duke of Normandy, visited the childless Eadward, and is said to have received from him the promise of the crown of England. The court was filled with Normans, but on the re-appearance of Godwine they hastily fled to the continent. Among them was Robert of Jumièges, who had been made archbishop of Canterbury. At his flight the high office was given to an Englishman. This action offended the pope, for, according to the papal claims, no church official could be deposed except by authority from Rome. Godwine died soon after, and was succeeded in the leadership by his son Harold.

Since Eadward was childless, it was necessary to determine who should succeed him. Although not of the royal line, Harold was the only possible candidate. His earldom was the largest in England. He was the right-hand man of the king, and he had shown the greatest ability both as a ruler and warrior. There was nothing to do but to revive the old German custom of electing the ablest man king, and it was accordingly agreed that Harold should succeed his royal master.

During his last years Eadward became even more inactive than before. The management of affairs was wholly in the hands of Harold, who put down a dangerous revolt in Wales, maintained peace and order throughout the kingdom, and administered the laws equitably. In England there was but

one family which could contest the crown with him, that of Leofric of Mercia, and this he conciliated by making Morkere, the brother of Leofric, earl of Northumbria, in the place of his own brother Tostig, against whom the Northumbrians had rebelled. On the death of Eadward, January 5, 1066, Harold was elected and crowned without opposition.

The German tribes of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden were almost entirely free from Roman influence till the ninth century. Christianity had certainly gained no hold upon *The Northmen*. They lived in independent groups, without any central government. But during the ninth century several leaders arose in various parts, who united many of the tribes, much as Chlodwig had united the Franks in the fifth century. Three kingdoms were established, known respectively as the kingdoms of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Since the leaders and nobles of the conquered tribes were too proud to submit to a conqueror they turned to the sea, hoping to preserve their independence. At first they played the part of pirates, attacking the coasts of Gaul, Germany, northern Spain, and even Italy. Ascending the rivers for many miles they robbed, plundered, and burned all the towns they could. They attacked monasteries and churches because of the treasures which they were known to contain. At first these raids were made in the summer, and the pirates returned to their homes for the winter. Gradually, however, they began to spend the winter also in the countries which they were plundering. They seized the land and settled upon it, and these winter settlements became permanent. As their success became known at home they were joined by large numbers of their fellow-countrymen, who were eager to have a share in their prosperity. Terms were made with the lord of the land, and these unwelcome guests made themselves at home and identified themselves with the country in which they settled. It was plainly to their interest that not too many Norsemen should join them, since their own portions would be thereby diminished; they therefore resisted all further immigration as well as practical invasions by their countrymen.

These Norsemen possessed to a marked degree the German characteristic, adaptability. In France they became Frenchmen, in England, Englishmen, in Russia, Russians. *Their character* They did not, however, lose their individuality. They preserved their courage, their genius for governing and their bodily vigour, their love of war and their thirst for fame. Like the Goths, when they migrated they left their religion at home, but not their religiousness. They accepted Roman Christianity with a heartiness which soon made them the champions of the papacy. They rebuilt the burned monasteries and churches and became the most zealous pilgrims of all Europe. They had the greatest regard for holy places and persons, and from pirates became Christian knights.

The lands to the east of the Baltic were attacked by the Norsemen also. About the middle of the ninth century they began to make settlements on the coast, and their *The Norsemen in the east.* leader, Rurik, succeeded in uniting the tribes of Finns, Lapps, Letts, and others who were scattered over what is now western Russia. He and his successors extended their power into the interior. Novgorod, on Lake Illman, and Kiev, on the Dnieper, became their most important centres. For more than seven hundred years the family of Rurik held the kingship and ruled over much of what is now Russia. In their raids to the east and south they came into contact with Constantinople, from which they received Christianity and the rudiments of civilization. In the tenth century a large body of Norsemen sailed down the Volga and raided a part of Persia. All the way from the Baltic to the Black Sea the Norsemen made settlements along the rivers, and thus was opened up a route of travel and commerce between the Scandinavian countries and Constantinople and the east. From the many coins of Bohemia, Hungary, and Constantinople, and even of the khalifs of Bagdad, which have been found in Sweden, we must infer that this commerce was very considerable. Christian pilgrims from the north regarded this as the most convenient way of reaching Palestine, because

they found some of their countrymen all along the route. In the eleventh century many Norsemen went to Constantinople to seek their fortunes and offer their services to the emperor, who enrolled large numbers of them in his body-guard.

About 800 the Norsemen began to settle in the Hebrides, Orkneys, and Shetland Islands, which up to this time were occupied only by Irish monks and hermits. From these islands they spread to the main-land of *In the west* Scotland, and in the course of about a hundred years all these settlements were united into one kingdom. In the ninth century they took possession of Iceland, which became thoroughly Norse. There the Norse customs and traditions were preserved in greater purity and for a longer time than in their original home.<sup>1</sup> In the tenth century the Norsemen settled in Greenland, and kept in constant intercourse with their mother-country till the fourteenth century, when they disappeared; from what cause is unknown.

About the year 1000, Norse sailors discovered the coast of America, and endeavoured to plant colonies there, but without success. On the east and south coast of Ireland they also made settlements, some of which continued to exist till far into the twelfth century. Their invasions of England have already been recounted, as well as those of France. *Normandy* The settlement of Rolf, in the valley of the lower Seine (Normandy), resulted in the establishment of a powerful duchy, which soon put an end to the invasions from the north. Duke Rolf (911-27) and his successors (William Longsword, 927-43, Richard the Fearless, 943-96, Richard the Good, 996-1027; and Robert the Magnificent, 1027-35) ruled with a strong hand, and Normandy was soon one of the strongest as well as best-governed duchies of France. The laws were enforced, orders preserved, and the vassals kept in subjection. In 911 Rolf had agreed to accept Christianity, and in spite of occasional backslidings he and his pirates

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Eddas and Sagas of the Norsemen, which were written in Iceland.



became devoted adherents of the Church. Normandy was noted for its churches, monasteries, and schools. The abbey of Bec was known throughout Europe because of its founder, *William the Bastard, Duke of Normandy.* Lanfranc, and its great prior, Anselm. Robert the Magnificent, at his death, in 1035, left an only bastard son, William, seven years old, to succeed him. 1035-87 When William attained his majority and attempted to rule independently, many of his subjects revolted. There was a bitter struggle, but William proved himself master of all his enemies and administered the affairs of his duchy with as much ability and firmness as any of his predecessors.

Eadward the Confessor is said to have promised his crown to William, who was his cousin. Another story of still more doubtful authenticity relates how Harold, shipwrecked on the coast of France, fell into the hands of William, who compelled him to take an oath that he would support William's claim to the throne. *William claims the English crown, 1066.* When the news of the accession of Harold reached William he fell into a great rage, and began to prepare to invade England and make good his pretensions to the crown. He is said to have called on Harold to keep his promise, but Harold paid no attention to his summons. He sent to the pope certain charges against Harold, and promised, in return for the papal support and sanction, to put the Church of England under the control of Rome. Alexander II gave William his blessing on these terms, and sent him a consecrated banner. William, in the meantime, built a fleet and collected his troops from every possible source.

King Harold was threatened with a double danger on his accession to the throne. His brother Tostig had revolted and fled to Harold Hardrada, king of Denmark, whom he urged to invade England. Harold also learned of the preparations of William, but was uncertain when these attacks would be made. He collected an army and patrolled the coast, but since no enemy appeared his men gradually left and went to their homes. Suddenly Harold Hardrada and

Tostig landed on the coast of Yorkshire, defeated the troops of the earls Edwin and Morkere, and took the city of York. King Harold hastened to the north, met the invaders near Stamford Bridge and utterly defeated them. On the same day William landed, unhindered, near Pevensey, with an army of about fifty thousand men, and began to ravage the country. By forced marches Harold hastened to the south to meet this new foe. Although deserted by the earls of Mercia and Northumbria, Edwin, and Morkere, he nevertheless determined to risk a battle without first collecting new troops and allowing his army to recuperate. Near Hastings, on a hill, known later as Senlac, Harold took a strong position, and was able for some hours to resist the onslaught of the Normans. In the end, however, he was slain, his guard cut down, and the rest of his troops put to flight. William had won the day and with it the crown of England.

*King Harold at Stamford Bridge, Sept. 25, 1066.*

*The battle of Hastings*

William's first care was to get possession of Kent and Sussex, the inhabitants of which were frightened into submission by his violence toward those who resisted him. He marched toward London and, hoping to overawe the city, burned Southwark. The inhabitants of London, however, closed the gates against him, elected as their king Eadgar the Aetheling, a grandson of Eadmund Ironside. The earls of Mercia and Northumbria, Edwin and Morkere, were present at the election, but when William crossed the Thames and threatened their territories they withdrew from the city to look after their own interests. Seeing that resistance was hopeless the people offered the crown to William. He entered the city, and on Christmas Day, 1066, was crowned in Westminster by the archbishop Ealdred. The crown was his by right of conquest, but he was also formally elected by the people of London, and in his coronation by the Church set its seal upon his title and supplied what was lacking in the legitimacy of his claims.

*William crowned, 1066.*

Thus far only the south-eastern part of England (bounded

by a line from the Wash to Dorsetshire) was actually in William's hands. To secure London he built a strong fortress, which afterward became the famous tower. The earls of Mercia and Northumbria submitted to him only nominally. In order to justify the seizure of whatever lands he might desire, William declared that the election and acknowledg-

*The land  
forfeit to  
William.* ment of Harold as king was an act of treason, punishable with forfeiture and death. All England was, therefore, guilty, and all the land was forfeited to William. He seized the possessions of all those who had borne arms against him, the rest being permitted to retain their lands on the payment of a fine. Otherwise there was for the present little change.

In 1067 England had become so quiet that William returned to Normandy, leaving the government in the hands of Odo, bishop of Bayeux, now earl of Kent, and William Fitz-Osbern, earl of Hereford. These, however, were untrue to their trusts, and allowed the English to be oppressed by the Norman nobles. This led the English to revolt. *The English revolt.* revolt, but William returned in the same year and put down the rebellion. In the year 1068, however, a real national uprising took place. King Swein of Denmark came with a fleet to contest the possession of England with William. On his arrival in the Humber all the northern, western, and south-western parts of England revolted, and the king of Scotland came to their aid. William hastened to the Humber and bought the withdrawal of the Danish fleet. He then turned to the revolted provinces and, since they were not united, easily overcame them. Yorkshire especially suffered from his anger. So thoroughly did he devastate it that a famine followed, which is said to have carried off more than a hundred thousand people, and nearly a century passed before the land was restored to its former state of cultivation. The most determined of the English fled to the Fens (the swampy district south of the Wash), and there offered brave resistance under the leadership of Hereward. Their destruction, however, ended all opposition, and England was

thoroughly conquered. He next invaded Scotland and made its king his vassal. Being now in full possession, William set himself to keep in subjection and to govern his hardly-acquired kingdom.

This Norman conquest of England had great influence on the history of England not simply because of the political changes which William introduced. He was not only king of England, but Duke of Normandy, and *Effect of the conquest.* a subject of the king of France. He was, moreover, a devoted friend of the papacy. It was, therefore, inevitable that England should be closely associated with the continent, the English kings, proud of their continental possessions, would be involved in territorial struggles with the French kings, and the claims of the popes for universal dominion would the more easily include England. The conquest brought England again into intimate relations with the rest of Europe and made of her a continental power.

## CHAPTER VI

### POLITICAL HISTORY OF FRANCE (887-1108)

LITERATURE—Bémont et Monod *Histoire de l'Europe et en particulier de la France*

Kitchin, *History of France*, Vol. I

*The Student's History of France*

Odo, the newly-elected king of France, was the best choice that could have been made by the Frankish nobles. He sur-  
*Odo, king,* passed them all in valour, was noted for his just  
888-98 and upright character, and, of all their number, had the largest landed possessions. His popularity was greatly increased by that of his father, Robert the Strong, who lost his life in resisting the invasion of the Northmen (866). But his position was not safe because he was only one of several great nobles, all of whom regarded themselves as practically his equal, and did not hesitate to oppose him and make war on him. For under the weak successors of Karl the Great the counts who had been the king's officers had increased their independence, and had made their office hereditary. In this way there arose the powerful counts of Flanders, Poitou, Anjou, Gascony, Paris, and others, whose lands came to be called the  
*The great* "great fiefs." The Northmen continued their in-  
*fiefs.*vasions, but Odo was not always so successful in repelling them as he had been. After 893 he had also to contend against the oft-renewed conspiracy of some of the strongest nobles to restore Charles the Simple to the throne. So long as he lived he successfully defended his title, but at last, worn out with the struggle, he died (898), after having named as his successor, not his brother Robert, who was his heir, but

Charles the Simple (898-929). Robert did homage to Charles, and received the duchy of France (a strip of territory which included, among other cities, Paris, Tours, and Orléans).

Charles the Simple was in many respects an able man, but his too ready confidence in the promises and loyalty of his subjects often brought him great trouble and loss, and won for him the title of Simple. The invasions of the Northmen continued without abate-

*Charles the Simple, 898-929.*

ment, and many of their bands now spent the winter in France, having taken possession of some of the districts about the mouth of the Seine and elsewhere. In 911 Charles offered their principal leader, Rolf (Rollo), the valley of the lower Seine and his daughter in marriage if he would settle there and become a Christian. It proved to be a wise measure, for it was to the interest of Rolf and his people that the invasions should cease.

*Settlement of the Northmen on the lower Seine*

The various bands of Northmen were soon gathered together under Rolf, and fresh invaders were repulsed. The district thus assigned to them received from them the name of Normandy.

Robert of France, repenting that he had refused the crown in 899, with two other great nobles, conspired to overthrow Charles and make himself king. In 923 the conspirators met the king's forces near Soissons and defeated them, but Robert himself was slain. His son Hugo was unwilling to claim the crown, and the nobles therefore elected the son-in-law of Robert, Rudolf of Burgundy, king. By treachery they got possession of the person of Charles and imprisoned him. His wife, however, escaped with her son to England, where she was received by her father, king Eadward the Elder. For twelve years Rudolf held the title of king, although during the first years of his reign his authority was very limited, and many of the great nobles refused to obey him. A quarrel with some of his nobles finally led to a brief restoration of Charles, but he was again imprisoned, and died soon afterward of starvation (929).

*Rudolf of Burgundy.*

Rudolf died (936) without children, and Louis IV.

(d'Outremer, Transmarinus) was recalled from England and made king Duke Hugo of Paris, still unwilling to risk all for the sake of a title which brought with it great difficulties and but little authority, preferred rather to be the favourite adviser of the king, for he could thereby easily increase his possessions. He was lord of Neustria, duke of Francia, and suzerain of Blois, Champagne, Chartres, Anjou, and other counties.

*Louis d'Outremer,* More than once Louis IV. was compelled to wage 936-54. war with his great vassal Hugo. His sudden death in 954 placed the crown on the head of his eldest son, Lothaire (954-86), a boy eight years old. The support of 954-86. Hugo was bought with the duchies of Aquitaine and Burgundy, but he died before he had made himself master of Aquitaine. His two sons, Hugo Capet and Otto, inherited his vast possessions, and also followed the policy of their great father and tried to gain possessions in the south of Gaul. Lothaire was a man of ability, but he made two fatal mistakes: he quarrelled with the clergy, and he set his heart on gaining Lotharingia, which was now a part of Germany. Consequently the clergy were constantly causing him trouble, and he was continually at war with the kings of Germany. Taking advantage of these hostile relations, Hugo Capet obtained the friendship of Otto III., and when Lothaire turned to Germany for help he found an alliance existing between his great vassal and the German king. Lothaire died before the revolution came, and his son, Louis V., succeeded him in 986. His death, however, took place the next year, and there was but one Karling left, Charles, duke of lower Lotharingia, who, being without power, could not hope to obtain the votes of the great nobles. On the other hand, Hugo Capet had the support of Otto III. of Germany, of the nobility, and of the Church. He was allied by marriage to some of the most powerful counts. The clergy and the monasteries were on his side, because he had taken special pains to win them by rich donations. The archbishop, Adalberon, of Rheims, and the bishops of the whole country called the nobles together for the purpose of electing a king, and

after a clever address, in which Adalberon proved that Charles was not the most suitable person for king, and that the crown was not hereditary but elective, he proposed the duke, Hugo Capet, and recounted his virtues and qualifications. The duke was unanimously elected and crowned as "King of the Gauls, Bretons, Danes, Normans, Aquitanians, Goths, Spaniards, and Gascons."

*Duke Hugo  
Capet elected  
king.*

In this way the crown came into the possession of the Capetians, a dynasty which was to rule France in the direct line for more than three hundred years (987-1328); for though the crown was declared to be elective, it soon became hereditary in this family. It was of the greatest influence on the history of the line that there was never lacking a male heir, generally of mature years, able to take up and carry out the policy of his predecessors. There were, therefore, no disputed successions, no disastrous regencies, no troubled elections.

*The  
Capetian  
Dynasty,  
987-1328.*

The position of the new line of the Capetians had its points of strength and weakness. Both the Merovingians and the Karlings had been consecrated by the Church and were therefore regarded as legitimate rulers. The Capets, upon being hailed by the Church, were

*The position  
of the king  
as king.*

accepted by a large part of the nation as the true successors to those great houses. The king thus became, for the majority of the people, an absolute sovereign, a power ordained of God to rule, to preserve order, and to administer justice. But there was another class, composed mostly of the nobility, which at this time was living in accordance with feudal customs and ideas, and to them the king was by no means absolute. His authority over them and his demands on them were limited. They were themselves kings in their domains in all but the name, and exercised royal prerogatives. These feudal ideas and customs the Capets were forced to recognize. The royal power was strictly limited, and it was only by following a consistent policy and by the greatest good fortune that the Capets were able in the end to triumph over feudalism and to establish

*And as  
feudal lord.*



a strong central government. But this was a long and slow process. For more than a hundred years the disintegration of power and of territory went on. The Capets were not able to keep their officials from making their offices hereditary, and their family possessions, as well as the royal domain which they had inherited from the Karlings, were diminished by constant usurpations. Their weakness was greatest in the eleventh century. The twelfth century, however, brought a change in their fortunes; from that time their power steadily increased.

The reign of Hugo Capet (987-96) was quite as successful as could be expected under the circumstances. He was *Hugo Capet*, generally recognized by the great vassals, and 987-96 maintained an independent attitude toward the German emperors and toward the papacy. Under him there was a distinct growth in the feeling of nationality which helped increase the separation between France and her neighbours, already caused by the differences in language and customs.

His son and successor, Robert II. (996-1031), surnamed the Pious, because of his humble and upright character and *Robert II.*, his regard for the truth, was none the less a 996-1031. warrior of ability, fighting vigorously for Lotharingia, and adding by conquest several cities and districts to his estates.

The reign of Henry I. (1031-60) was disastrous for the royal power, although the king himself was both brave and *Henry I.*, active. He was continually engaged in a struggle 1031-60, with the nobles whose territories surrounded his own, especially with the counts of Blois and the *and the great vassals.* dukes of Normandy. The only outlet from his estates to the sea was the Seine, the lower part of which was in the possession of the Normans, whose numbers and warlike qualities made their duke a dangerous neighbour of the king. Henry I. appreciated the situation and made every effort, though in vain, to make himself master of Normandy. Its duke, William, already known to us as the

conqueror of England, was able to maintain his independent position

Philip I. (1060-1108) followed the policy of his father in regard to Normandy and the other great fiefs. He was too young to prevent duke William from making his conquest of England, but he did all he could to weaken him by fomenting quarrels in the family of William and by endeavouring to keep Normandy and England as independent of each other as possible. This policy he handed down to his successors. He carried on in a creditable manner, several wars with other great vassals, and was successful in adding certain lands to his possessions. He refused to go on the first crusade, resisted the claims of Gregory VII., and treated that part of the clergy of France which supported the pope with a good deal of severity. Such conduct, now regarded as specially creditable to him, brought upon him the disfavour of the chroniclers, who have generally painted him in the darkest colours, charging him with gluttony, laziness, debauchery, highway robbery, and many other vices and crimes. In his later years his activity was limited by his abnormal obesity, which amounted in his case to a disease. His reign, however, was not without its achievements, although the growing feudalism of the country daily diminished the actual power of the king. Feudal castles and strongholds were numerous, and the king met with resistance on all hands. The famous castle of Montlhéry was at the very gates of Paris, and the king was actually in danger of being taken prisoner by his own brigand subjects and held for a ransom if he ventured outside of his city without a strong guard. The chaos and anarchy of feudalism were at their height; but the reign of Louis VI. (1108-37) brought a change. Under him the power of the king increased, the lawlessness of the times was checked, order was partly re-established, and feudal customs became more fixed, thereby diminishing the violence that had been so prevalent and increasing the general security. The condition of the country was by no means

*Philip I.,  
1060-1108,  
surnamed  
the Fat*

*Louis VI.,  
1108-37.*

perfect, but it was of the greatest importance that a large amount of stability was introduced into the customs and practices of the government and of society. The kings of France possessed a great advantage over the kings of Germany in that they were allowed to retain all fiefs which fell vacant, while in Germany the great dukes compelled the king to re-let all fiefs within a year. The kings of France, therefore, had an excellent opportunity to increase their possessions, while the kings of Germany were cut off from that advantage.

## CHAPTER VII

### GERMANY AND ITS RELATION TO ITALY (887-1056)

#### LITERATURE as in Chap III

THE deposition of Karl the Fat left Arnulf in the possession of the German crown (887-99). As successor of *Arnulf*, 887- Karl the Great, he assumed that he was entitled 99 to a certain sovereignty over all the rulers of the west, and accordingly demanded and received the acknowledgment of his supremacy from the kings of Burgundy, Italy, and the West Franks. He defeated with great slaughter the Northmen (891), but was unable to subdue the Slavic kingdom of Moravia, which included much of what is now Bohemia and Austria. At the invitation of the pope, Arnulf made two journeys into Italy, for the purpose of restoring order there and relieving the pope from the tyranny of his enemies, in return for which services the pope crowned him emperor (896).

The reign of his son, known as Ludwig the Child (899-911), was fatal to the unity of Germany. The local nobility, filled with a desire for independent power, seized offices and lands and made them hereditary in their own families. As the empire of Karl the Great had broken up into many little states, so the kingdom of Arnulf fell apart into five great duchies, known as Franconia, Saxony, Bavaria, Swabia, and Lotharingia. Owing to the weakness of the king, certain men in these duchies were able to usurp authority and assume the title of duke, and were, in their duchies, practically independent of the king. The boundaries of the duchies, following tribal lines, helped to

*Ludwig, the  
Child, 899-  
911.*

*The great  
Duchies.*

preserve and perpetuate the differences that already existed among these five great groups of Germans. The people of each duchy longed to be independent of all the others, and preferred their own narrow interests to those of the kingdom.

With the death of Ludwig the Child the line of Karl the Great came to an end in Germany, and it was therefore necessary to elect a king. The honour fell to Conrad I, of Franconia, king, 911-18. Conrad I. (911-18), duke of Franconia. Although able, brave, active, and ambitious to rule well, his reign was spent in a vain endeavour to make good the traditional authority of the king over the dukes. He allied himself closely with the clergy, and at a council at Altheim (916) they threatened with the ban all who should resist him. Political disaffection was to be regarded as heresy and punished in the same way. But even with the aid of the clergy Conrad could not reduce the dukes, and at his death he designated as his successor his most powerful rival, Henry of Saxony.

The nobles of Saxony and Franconia came together in Fritzlar and elected Henry king (called the Fowler, also the Builder of Cities, 919-36). He was a practical man, who saw all the difficulties of the position, and was persuaded that a feudal kingship was the only kind now possible. The days of the Karlings were gone for ever. The power of the dukes was not to be broken, their independence in their own territory was not to be questioned, and they were to be held responsible to the king only for the feudal duties which they recognized as due him. This feudal conception of the kingship was new, and radically changed the attitude of the king toward the clergy and the dukes, for as he meant to be friendly with the dukes, he did not need the special help of the clergy. After his election, the archbishop of Mainz, as primate of the kingdom, wished to anoint him, but Henry refused, saying that the election alone was sufficient.

In 924 the Magyars, or Hungarians, invaded Saxony. Henry was unable to meet them in the field, and therefore made a nine years' treaty with them, paying them a heavy

tribute These years Henry used to put his country into a good state of defence and to improve his army *Progress in* His preparations are described by Widukind (i, 35) *Germany.* as follows · “He first chose one out of every nine soldiers who were living in the country and compelled him to live in a city (urbs), in order that he might build dwellings for the other eight and lay by one-third of all the grain produced, while the other eight should sow and harvest for the ninth. In these cities, on the construction of which they laboured day and night, the king ordered that all trials, meetings, and festivals of whatever sort, should be held, in order that the people in *The found-* times of peace might become accustomed to what *ing of cities.* would be necessary in time of war (*i.e.*, to living together in close quarters)” Towns are mentioned which he fortified, such as Merseburg, Meissen, and Quedlinburg There were walled towns before his time, but most of the Germans lived in open, straggling villages Henry gave a great impulse to town life, and it was due to his activity that the German towns now became more numerous, and that in the next century there was a large and important citizen class Commerce was also thereby greatly promoted. During these years of peace Henry developed a good army. All who did military service were trained in the use of arms by military sports, and a cavalry troop was formed. The Saxons, it would seem, up to this time, had fought only on foot The new mode of fighting was soon to become common, since it was generally those who had some means who were called on to follow the king on his campaigns. The poorer people being unable to equip themselves with horses and arms, now sank to the position of serfs slaves, and so escaped military service.

Henry was successful in wresting territory from both the Danes on the north and the Slavs on the east. In 933 he refused to pay the Magyars tribute, met them in the field, and defeated them with great loss in several battles The superiority of the improved method of defence, the walled towns, the cavalry, and the trained army, was now apparent Before his death (936) he had his son Otto recognized as his successor.

*Henry extends Germany to the East.*

Otto I (936-73) came to the throne with a different character and with ideas about his office entirely different from those of his father. Henry was noted for his modesty and humility. he was practical, and never strove for the impossible. He clearly recognized that he could not destroy the power of the dukes, and was therefore willing to recognize their independence. Otto, on the contrary, was proud and ambitious. He had high ideas about his royal rights and prerogatives. He was not content with the position of feudal king, but regarded himself as the successor of Karl the Great. The sacred character of the king, acquired by anointment and by the peculiar relations existing between himself and the clergy, had been neglected by Henry, but Otto revived it. The dukes had been his father's equals; Otto determined to make them his officials. Henry had not relied on the clergy, because he was determined to be on friendly terms with the dukes, Otto, on the other hand, needed the help of the clergy to strip the dukes of their power. The events connected with his election and coronation illustrate the difference between his ideals and those of his father. There had been some dissatisfaction with Henry because of his simplicity, and there was now a desire that the traditions of Karl the Great should be revived. In accordance with this wish, Aachen, the ancient capital, was appointed as the place for the formal election of Otto. All the dukes and the highest nobility were present, and Otto was anointed and crowned with great pomp. Afterward he sat down to the coronation banquet, at which he was served by the dukes. Duke Gisibert of Lorraine was his chamberlain, *i.e.* he had charge of the palace, Eberhard of Franconia was his steward or dish-bearer, Hermann of Suabia his cup-bearer, and Arnulf of Bavaria his marshal.

But Otto's haughty manner angered the dukes, and they plotted with his ambitious brothers for his overthrow. A long struggle ensued, in which Otto was successful in dispossessing all the dukes, and making their duchies dependent on himself, by giving them to members of his own family. As a counter-

poise to the power of the nobles, Otto followed the policy of strengthening the clergy by enriching them and conferring authority upon them.<sup>1</sup> The clergy thus became a large and powerful part of the nobility. This policy proved to be disastrous, for in the struggle which came later between the empire and the papacy, the clergy of Germany turned against their benefactors and helped destroy them.

Toward the barbarians east of Germany Otto had a well-defined policy. In 955, on the Lech river, near Augsburg, he won a decisive victory over the Magyars, and put an end to their invasions by compelling them, after accepting Christianity, to settle in the territory which they have ever since occupied (Hungary). The Slavs, too, were compelled to acknowledge Otto's overlordship. As a defence against them several marches (marks) were established along the whole eastern frontier and put under able men.

Magdeburg was made the religious capital of the Slavs by establishing there an archbishop. Mission work was vigorously carried on among them, and for this purpose Otto established the bishoprics of Havelberg, Brandenburg, Merseburg, Zeitz, Meissen, and Posen. Many monasteries arose, and the monks became not only the missionaries but also the teachers and civilizers of these barbarian peoples. German colonists went with the monks and clergy, and the process of Germanizing the Slavs was begun. To Otto the Great belongs the honour of having begun the policy toward these barbarians which was to result in making Germans of them, and in adding their territory to Germany. The east was the only direction in which Germany could expand. The way to the west was closed, but to the east there were extensive territories which could be conquered and Germanized. If these peoples could be kept dependent on Germany for their civilization and Christianity, it must inevitably follow that they would lose their nationality and become German. From this time on the expansion of Ger-

*Otto's policy  
toward the  
barbarians*

*The Slavs  
Christian-  
ized and  
German-  
ized*

<sup>1</sup> Bryce "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. viii., develops this thought at some length.



many to the east among these peoples, her conquest and absorption of them, is one of the most important parts of her history. In this way all of Prussia that lies east of the Elbe was won from the Slavs. Bohemia and Hungary were not Germanized because, through the weakness of the successors of Otto, they succeeded in getting an independent ecclesiastical establishment, thereby preserving their own nationality.

Since the coronation of Arnulf, Italy had fallen upon evil times. She was hopelessly divided, the theatre of contending peoples and factions. The Greek emperor held many places in the southern part of the peninsula, while the Mohammedans had possession of Sicily and other islands, and a few ports on the mainland. In Rome the pope claimed to be master, but the city was the prey of factions among the nobility. The duchies of Benevento and Spoleto were practically independent. Lombardy was divided into a large number of insignificant principalities, whose rulers were all striving for the control of Italy and the royal or imperial crown. One of these claimants, Lothar of Provence, died in 950, and his widow, Adelaide, a Burgundian princess, was seized by another claimant of the crown for the purpose of compelling her to marry his son. Disliking the proposed union, Adelaide appealed to the king of Germany for protection. Otto gallantly responded by crossing the Alps (951) and marrying the princess himself. It was his intention to go on to Rome, but revolts at home made his speedy return to Germany necessary.

During this period the papacy lost in reputation by falling under the control of political parties in Rome. The magnificent claims of Leo the Great to be the bishop of the whole Church were now entirely forgotten in the chaos of contending Roman parties. The noble families of Rome were divided into factions, each of which strove to make one of its number bishop, in order to exercise the authority and enjoy the perquisites which that office possessed. The duke of Spoleto had a party, as did also Berengar and the

other phantom kings who displayed their weakness in the unfortunate peninsula. The German king had his supporters, and there was an anti-German faction which objected to any interference on the part of the German king. The rage and violence shown by these factions is almost incredible. In 891 Formosus, a friend of Arnulf of Germany, was made pope. Throughout his pontificate he was known to be an ally of the German emperor, and the bitterness against him was intense. When Stephen VI. was elected by the faction of Spoleto his hatred of the Germans was so great that he had the remains of Formosus exhumed in order to go through the forms of a trial. The body of Formosus was clothed in pontifical robes, placed on a papal throne, and charges made against him, in a synod called together for this purpose. The verdict was, of course, unfavourable, and his body was mutilated and thrown into the Tiber.

For nearly forty years Rome was in a turmoil of contending parties, no one being able to restore order. But finally, in the course of these struggles, a certain Alberic drove out all competitors and made himself master of the

*Alberic.*

city with the title of "Princeps atque omnium Romanorum senator." Until his death in 954 Alberic held the power in Rome, not only over the city but also over the popes. The writings of the times contain many invectives, but few charges, against Alberic. As a governor he had much ability. He tried to ally himself with the eastern emperor, and he was interested in the Cluniac reform to such an extent that he asked bishop Odo of Cluny to restore the discipline in, and reform the monasteries of, Rome. His only offence, a great one in the eyes of Churchmen, was that he kept the papacy thoroughly under his control and used the pope as one of his officials. Alberic even wished to make the papacy

*The Papacy  
to become  
hereditary.*

hereditary in his family. His son Octavian, a boy of sixteen years, succeeded him in authority, and a year later was made pope. He took the title of John XII. (955). His pontificate was disgraceful in the extreme, and he shocked the city with his mad pranks and open debauchery.

Both he and the people of Lombardy are said to have appealed to Otto for protection. At any rate, Otto again appeared in Italy, and after being crowned emperor (962), spent several months in renovating the papacy and restoring order. The people of Rome took an oath to him that they would never elect a pope without first consulting him.

Under Otto the Great Germany was made the first power in Europe. In 973 he celebrated Easter at Quedlinburg, and held there a great assembly, where he received embassies from Rome, Constantinople, from the Hungarians, Bulgarians, *Death of Otto I., 973.* Russians, Slavs, and Danes. The dukes of Bohemia and Poland came in person to do him homage. A few days later he died at Memleben, and was buried in Magdeburg, his favourite city.

The reign of Otto the Great is an important one in the history of the civilization of Germany. It has already been *Importance of his reign.* stated that he allied himself with, and strengthened, the clergy in order to resist the dukes, but while using them in this way, Otto did not lower their moral and religious tone. His bishops and archbishops were all men of ability and genuine piety. His reign is noted for a revival in both religion and learning. Several members of his family occupied high positions in the Church; Bruno, his brother, became archbishop of Cologne; one of his sons, William, was archbishop of Mainz, his uncle, Robert, bishop of Trier, other relatives became prominent bishops, abbots, and abbesses. All these performed their duties to the Church as well as to the emperor without any conflict. At the court itself no immorality was tolerated. Otto surrounded himself with learned men, and his age is marked by great literary activity. Many of the great monasteries kept chronicles. Some important histories and biographies were composed, and poems and comedies were produced. The most notable among them were Luitprand's "History of Otto," The Annals of Quedlinburg, Hildesheim, and St Gall, Widukind's *Res Gestæ Saxoniarum*, Ekkehard's "Walthari Lied," and the historical poems and dramas of Hrotsuitha, a nun in the

monastery of Ganderisheim. Her "Lapsus et Conversio Theophili" is regarded as the oldest poetical treatment of the Faust legend of the Middle Age. In the monasteries, Terence, Horace, Virgil, Sallust, and Cicero were read. Otto also imitated the *Schola Palatina* of Karl the Great. Otto himself tried to learn Latin, but never became able to speak it well. During his reign German became a literary language. a harmony of the gospels was composed in it, and a great epic poem written, called "Der Heliand" (The Saviour). It is a life of Jesus put into a German setting. It is full of German customs, manners, and ways of thinking, and is one of the most important sources of our knowledge of the condition of the German mind in those times.

By receiving the imperial crown, Otto renewed the political bonds which had once held Germany and Italy together. This union was in many respects injurious to both countries. Instead of exerting themselves in an effort to unite Germany and to centralize the power, the emperors, drawn into a long and fatal struggle with the papacy, wore themselves out in fruitless Italian campaigns, which ended disastrously to the Hohenstaufen line. France and England were unified under their own kings, while Italy and Germany were unable to achieve political unity till in our own day.

Otto II. (973-83), although able, resisted in vain the decadence that had begun. The barbarians dis- *Otto II.,*  
arranged the system of marches on the frontier 973-83-  
and checked the extension of Germany to the east. Otto II.  
was succeeded by his three-year-old son, Otto III. *Otto III.,*  
(983-1002), who was brought up by his mother 983-1002.  
and tutors in the fantastical idea that he should restore Rome to her former greatness by making her the seat of his government. He made several journeys into Italy to restore order and reform the papacy. In 996 he made his cousin pope, Gregory V., and in 999 elevated to the papacy his tutor, Gerbert, the most learned man of his age, with the name of Sylvester II. Leaving Germany at the mercy of the nobles

and the barbarians, Otto III. went to Italy and took up his residence on the Aventine Hill (1001). His death the next year ended a reign that was as disastrous for Germany as for the imperial power.

Henry II. (1002-24), known as the Saint, by allying himself closely with the clergy, and giving his attention principally to Germany, was able to revive in part the failing authority of the king. The work was taken up and more successfully prosecuted by his successor, Conrad II. (1024-39), duke of Franconia. He increased the royal authority in every way possible. By the bequest of the last king of Burgundy he inherited that kingdom (1032). He got possession of the duchies in Germany, and either held them himself or gave them to members of his family. He sought to diminish the feudal power of the great nobles by decreeing that the subjects owed the king military service directly and must come at his call. He won the sympathy of all sub-vassals by declaring their fiefs hereditary, and forbidding the great lords to dispossess them without sufficient cause.

By increasing the territory of the empire and strengthening the boundaries, by attaching the smaller nobles to himself and getting full possession of the duchies, Conrad II. laid the foundation for the prosperous reign of his son, Henry III. (1039-56). Although Henry III. was unsuccessful against both the Slavs and Hungarians, he was able to hold the turbulent nobles of Germany in check. According to feudal principles, every one had the right of private war. Any one who suffered violence might gather as large a force as he could muster and avenge himself on the offender. The Church, alleging that no Christian should shed blood, attempted to establish the "peace of God" on earth by prohibiting all warfare, but finding it impossible to enforce so sweeping a prohibition, she ordered that all combatants should observe the "truce of God" by refraining from all fighting or violence from Wednesday evening till the following Monday morning. Henry III. not only sanctioned this, but assumed

the right to punish all who should in any way disturb the peace of the land.

Unlike his father, Henry III did not practise simony. He appointed both bishops and abbots, and was careful to choose only men that were worthy and able to fill the position. He never sold church offices. Taking up the great movement which had its origin in the monastery of Cluny, he endeavoured to reform the morals and life of the clergy of Germany in accordance therewith. He fostered the schools in the monasteries and established other schools for laymen, attendance at which he even thought of making compulsory on the children of the nobles.

Henry made two journeys into Italy (1046 and 1055), during the first of which he received the imperial crown. The papacy had again become a city office in the hands of factions. Each party elected a pope *Henry III. reforms the papacy* whenever its needs seemed to demand such action.

When Henry reached Italy (1046) he found three popes claiming the office. In councils at Sutri and Rome he deposed all three, assumed the title of *patricius*, and, declaring it was his right to name the bishop of Rome, elevated to that position Sudgar of Bamberg, who took the name of Clement II. During the rest of his reign Henry three times filled the office, always with excellent men. In Italy he opposed simony in all its forms, and refused to take bribes from the candidates for the papal throne. The Cluniac ideas were rapidly gaining ground, and, since Henry was in hearty sympathy with them, he did all he could to establish them, working harmoniously with the popes and other reformers to make the Church what she should be.

Henry III. wished to be an absolute master and to rule in an autocratic way. His treatment of the nobles was especially distasteful to them, and at his death in 1056 the opportunity was offered them to regain their much-coveted power. He left a son, Henry IV., only six years old, who was no match for them. The emperors, Henry III. not least, had done everything they could to make the Church great and powerful,

believing that the clergy would always be grateful and true to their benefactors. Just at the critical time, however, when Henry IV. was a mere boy, and more than ever needed their help, they deserted him and supported the high claims of the bishop of Rome. The emperor had claimed and exercised the right to appoint the pope. The tables were now to be turned, and the pope was soon to claim the authority to make and unmake both kings and emperors. The fatal struggle between the papacy and the emperor for the supremacy of the world was about to begin.

A new power was just arising in southern Italy which was destined to give very valuable aid to the papacy and to play an important part in the long struggle. From the middle of the ninth century the Saracens had possession of Sicily, and also held many places on the main-land. The principal part of southern Italy, called the theme of Lombardy, still belonged to the emperor at Constantinople, and was ruled by his officers. On the east coast these possessions extended to the north as far as Mount Gargano, and on the west almost to Salerno. To the north of this district was a large group of independent or semi-independent principalities, such as Salerno, Amalfi, Naples, Capua, Benevento, and Spoleto, which neither the Greek nor the German emperor had been able to attach permanently to his interests. They spent their time in warring with one another, or with the garrisons of the Greeks or Saracens about them. They were mere political fragments, and their condition seemed hopelessly chaotic.

In 1016 some Normans, returning from a pilgrimage to Palestine, were shipwrecked near Salerno, and the prince of that town secured their aid in an impending battle against the Saracens. The rewards which they carried back home with them fired the cupidity of some of their fellow-countrymen, and from this time we find Norman soldiers of fortune in southern Italy offering their services to the highest bidder. About 1027 the duke of Naples granted

*Condition of  
southern  
Italy*

*The Nor-  
mans get  
possessions  
in southern  
Italy and  
become the  
pope's  
vassals.*

Avèisa to a band of such adventurers, and by conquest they added other small territories to this. Having quarrelled with their allies, the Greeks, over the distribution of spoil, they attacked and conquered Apulia, which they organized into a kind of republic. The headship in this little state was acquired by William of the Iron Arm, who passed it on to his brothers, each of whom followed an aggressive policy of conquest and annexation. In 1053 they made war on pope Leo IX. After taking him prisoner, they fell at his feet, begged forgiveness, and asked to be made his vassals and confirmed in their title to the lands which they had conquered.

In 1057 the ablest of the brothers, Robert Guiscard, succeeded to the title of count of Apulia. Two years later he appeared before pope Nicholas II. (1059-61), gave him the oath of allegiance, and received in return the title of duke of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily. Sicily and a part of Calabria were still in the hands of the Saracens, and the newly-made duke had to conquer them. After about thirty years of petty warfare, the Mohammedan power was broken and the Norman rule established in Sicily. Robert ruled his duchy well, Amalfi was for a while one of the principal commercial cities of Italy, and the schools of Salerno also added lustre to his name.

*Robert  
Guiscard  
made duke,  
1059.*

*Sicily  
conquered,  
1060-1090.*

A revolution in Constantinople gave Robert an opportunity to attempt to extend his territories to the east. In 1081 Alexius Comnenus usurped the power and expelled the emperor Nicephorus III. Constantine, the son of the preceding emperor, Michael VII, had married the daughter of Robert Guiscard. Apparently to restore his son-in-law, who had a distant claim to the crown, but probably to secure the crown for himself, Robert Guiscard gathered an army to invade the Greek empire. Gregory VII. gave him his blessing, and promised to invest him with all the lands he might conquer. Durazzo, on the coast of Epirus, was first taken. Alexius sent Henry IV. of Germany large sums of money, and begged him

*Robert  
attacks the  
Greek  
emperor.*



to make an invasion into southern Italy. Alexius also secured the aid of the Venetians by granting them commercial privileges, such as the freedom from tolls and the possession of a Venetian quarter in Constantinople. After capturing Durazzo, Robert forced his way into the interior. Towns and fortresses fell into his hands until he controlled much of Epirus and Thessaly. At this moment Gregory VII, who was hard pressed by Henry IV, called on Robert to come to his aid. Leaving his army in charge of his son Boemund, Robert hastened to Rome, where he succeeded in driving off the Germans and freeing the pope. But in Thessaly the diplomacy of Alexius won the victory. By offering large bribes he won over many of the Norman knights. He levied fresh troops in other parts of the empire. Boemund's forces were gradually weakened by losses in battle, by sickness and desertions, so that Alexius was able to defeat him and gradually force him back to the Adriatic. At last, Durazzo was re-taken, and Boemund with his handful of men returned to Italy. Although Robert Guiscard renewed the attempt, Alexius had in the meanwhile so strongly fortified and garrisoned the coast that Robert met with small success. His untimely death in the following year (1085) put an end to the invasion, and Boemund made peace with Alexius.

*Death of  
Robert,  
1085.*

*Basis for a  
new king-  
dom.*

The work of Robert Guiscard was to live after him. By his conquests he had united Sicily and the southern part of Italy into one great duchy, which was to be the basis for the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. He was succeeded as duke by his brother Roger in 1085, who in turn was followed by his son, Roger II (1101). This second Roger, inheriting the well-known family characteristics, ambition and great ability, succeeded in changing his duchy into a kingdom (1130).

## CHAPTER VIII

### FEUDALISM

#### LITERATURE.—Adams, *Civilization*

Hallam, *Middle Ages*.

Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*.

Pollock and Maitland, *The History of the English Law*.

Emerton, *Introduction to the Middle Ages*

Turner, *The Germanic Constitution*

Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*.

Guizot, *Civilization in Europe*, Lecture IV

Penn. Univ. *Translations*, Vols. III., II., V., IV., III.

FEUDALISM is the name applied to the economic, social, and political relations and conditions existing in Europe from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries. These economic relations are expressed by the phrase "feudal tenure of land," the theory underlying which was that the tenant or holder of any piece of land had only the use of it, for which he must pay certain dues as rent, to the man (lord or suzerain) from whom he had received it. Property in land was not absolute, but of a beneficiary nature; that is, the holder had only the benefits of the use of it, not the land itself. In theory the land belonged to God, who let it to the king, who, in turn, sublet it to his great vassals, and these then parcelled it out to their subjects. The general word expressing the social relations of the period is "vassalage," which indicates the personal relation and bond existing between the man who thus held the land and the man from whom he had received it. It conveys on the side of the vassal the idea of social inferiority and the obligation to perform certain services for his lord.

*Feudalism defined.*

*Economic relations, feudal tenure.*

*Social relations, lord and vassal.*

(The political relations of the period are expressed by the words "immunity, and sovereignty," which mean that the holder of an estate is, in the matter of its government, independent of his lord; that is, with the use of the land he also received from his lord the right, within his own territory, to perform the judicial, executive, and even, to some extent, the legislative functions of government, and in the ordinary exercise of these functions he is free from all interference on the part of his lord. He is, therefore, on his own domain, to all intents and purposes, and, within certain limits, an independent king. The essential features of feudalism then are these three things—feudal tenure, vassalage, and immunity.)

This condition of affairs was the outcome of the chaos of the two centuries which followed the death of Karl the Great.

Not even he had been able wholly to centralize the power, and to sustain a personal relation to all his subjects. He struggled during all his reign against the tendency to separation, and the ambitious efforts of various provinces of his empire to achieve local independence. The machinery of his government was not inherently weak; it needed only a strong and vigorous man to conduct it. Under his successors, in the ninth and tenth centuries, because of their weakness, and the struggles of rebellious sons and nobles, his empire broke up into many pieces. There was no one to enforce the laws, and preserve order, since the emperor was too weak to do so. Men found that they could break the laws, therefore, with impunity. The strong oppressed the weak, seized their goods, their lands, and even their persons, forcing them into the position of vassals or serfs. This is the period of violence and usurpations, or what the Germans most appropriately call *Faustrecht* or "fist right"; the man with the strong arm might do whatever he chose. The wheels of government stopped, and the people had, therefore, to take care of themselves. (Duruy, Bk. V, chap. xv. "Royalty no longer performed the duties for which it was instituted, and protection, which could not be obtained from the nominal head of the state, was

now sought from the bishops, counts, barons, and all powerful men." Their attempts to take care of themselves resulted in a complicated set of customs and practices, the sum of which was feudalism. The weak man, in order that he might not be utterly destroyed by the violence of those who were stronger than he, often willingly surrendered all that he had to some bishop or count, put himself under his protection, and assumed the vassal relation. The violence and chaos of the ninth and tenth centuries produced these changes and brought about this condition of affairs. Even before the ninth century there were prevalent among the peoples of Europe many customs which furnished certain elements of feudalism, but they were not what produced it. Such things as the German *comitatus*, or *Gefolge*, and the Gallic "commendation," undoubtedly were prototypes of some of the feudal customs, but these would not have developed into feudalism if it had not been for the chaotic economic, social, and political condition of Europe in those two centuries. ✓

Under Karl the Great tenure of office had depended upon his will, under his weak successors, many of the imperial and royal officials declared that they not only held their offices by a life tenure, but that these were also hereditary in their family. These claims they were able to make good in spite of the imperial opposition. In this way the judicial, executive, and legislative functions of the central government were usurped. Karl the Great had rewarded his officials with gifts of lands. Under his successors, all the holders of such lands succeeded in making their possessions hereditary in their family, while still recognizing the emperor as the actual possessor of them.

Many who held property by the allodial (freehold or fee simple) tenure were deprived of their lands by force and reduced to the position of vassals. Others, when they saw themselves exposed to so great danger, bought protection by offering to surrender their lands to some lord on the condition that he would protect them and permit them, as his tenants or vassals, to hold the

*Office and  
lands be-  
come heredi-  
tary.*

*Freehold  
lands become  
feudal.*

same lands. Under the emperors of the sixth and seventh centuries, a similar process was going on because of the heavy taxation and the oppression by the government. Previously all land had been held by the allodial tenure, but gradually this was so thoroughly changed that by the end of the twelfth century the principle was generally acknowledged that all land must have a feudal lord and be held by the feudal tenure. In the thirteenth century there was very little land in western and northern Europe held in any other way. Fiefs and vassalage, therefore, arose in grants, usurpations, seizures, and voluntary surrender.

Since feudalism grew out of the chaos of the times, it could hardly be expected that it would have a uniform character. In fact, the feudalism of one province differed from that of another. In the general stress and danger each one made such terms as he could with his lord. Feudalism is not a system, therefore; it is as chaotic and irregular as the period in which it arose. To almost every general statement about it exceptions could be found. Classifications are impossible, because of the great and numerous variations which are everywhere met with. It is a misnomer to speak of the feudal "system," since by that word the idea is conveyed that it is an orderly and uniform set of customs and regulations.

A great step toward better things was taken when Henry III declared himself to be guardian of the public peace, or "peace of the land," and threatened to punish all who disturbed it. By this means private warfare was partially limited. The chaos and anarchy of the ninth and tenth centuries yielded in a measure to regularity and order. The customs were more fixed and better observed. Feudalism became less chaotic, and society, therefore, more stable; violence became less and security greater; travel was possible because of the greater safety along the highways. The effect was soon seen in the steady revival of commerce, which became more pronounced as the eleventh century advanced.

The Church was completely drawn into feudal relations.

In those days of violence and rapine, the robber and plunderer had little or no regard for the property of the Church, or the lives of the Churchmen. Churches and monasteries, like individuals, were, therefore, compelled to seek protection. The bishop or priest, for his church or diocese, and the abbot or prior, for his monastery, surrendered the church's or monastery's property to some lord and received it back in return for the payment of certain rents and dues. Such churches and monasteries were legally feudal individuals, and were, of course, required to perform all feudal duties. The lands, indeed, belonged to the Church, and, theoretically, could not be alienated from the Church and ecclesiastical uses. As late as the eleventh century it was not at all uncommon for the clergy to marry. Since fiefs were hereditary, it seemed perfectly proper that their children should be provided for out of the church lands which they held. But unless all their children became clergymen, these church lands would pass into the hands of laymen and therefore be lost to the Church. One of the purposes of the prohibition of the marriage of the clergy was to prevent this alienation and diminution of the church lands.

The land, office, or any right or privilege granted and held as indicated above was called a fief, fee, or benefice. The lord, liege, or suzerain was the one who granted a fief. The receiver of it was his vassal or liege-man. Sub-infeudation was the re-granting of a fief by a vassal to a third person, who, therefore, became a vassal to a vassal. In connection with the infeudation of a fief there were certain rights and ceremonies called homage; kneeling with uncovered head, folded hands, and sword ungirt before his prospective lord, the vassal made a set speech in which he vowed that he would become the lord's "man," and perform all the duties which this relation demanded. The lord then raised him, received his oath of fidelity, and by a symbolic act (usually the presentation of a sword, standard, sceptre, ring, staff, a bit of earth or a twig) invested him with the possession of the fief in question.

*The Church  
and feudal-  
ism*

*Feudal  
terms.*

The one great duty of the lord to his vassal was to protect him. The lord must avenge his vassal's wrongs, defend him in all his privileges, and secure him justice in all matters. The vassal, on the other hand, owed his lord service, which might be of various kinds. *Noble or military service.* Military service was, in some respects, the most important, and in accordance with the ideas of the times was regarded as noble. Service in labour, gifts, money, and produce, was regarded as menial or ignoble. Military service in the days of Karl the Great had been required of all freemen. The army was composed of the whole people under arms. As the use of cavalry was introduced and became general, and the practice of wearing armour universal, it became impossible for every one to equip himself with the required paraphernalia. Continuous and far-distant campaigns made it necessary for many people to remain at home to till the soil. Karl the Great had the right to call his army together at any time, and demand their service in any part of the empire, and for any length of time. By offering united resistance the vassals later succeeded in acquiring two important limitations to this: they could be compelled to serve only forty days in the year, and only at a reasonable distance from their homes.

Feudal armies could not be levied directly by the king; he must first send the summons to his great vassals, with the order to appear with a certain number of men at a certain time and place. These, in turn, delivered the order to their vassals, and so the command was passed along until it had reached the end of the line of vassals. Under such conditions it is easily apparent that a feudal army was of little use, even when it was got together. Since wars must be fought, the rulers ceased to rely on their feudal levies, and engaged mercenary troops, which they kept as a standing army. Among the special duties laid upon a vassal were the following: If in a battle the lord were unhorsed, the vassal must give him his own horse; if the lord were in personal danger, the vassal must defend him with his life; if the lord were taken prisoner of war, the vassal was bound to go as a hostage for him.

There were various circumstances under which the lord might demand money from his vassals. When he knighted his eldest son, or gave his eldest daughter in marriage, or himself was taken prisoner, he might demand any sum which his vassal was able to pay. Such payments were called "aids," and tended to become fixed. A relief was a sum of money paid by an heir when he entered upon his inheritance at the death of his father. Ordinarily this was the entire income of the estate for a year. The same rule existed in regard to ecclesiastical offices. The newly-appointed bishop or priest was compelled to pay the first-fruits (the annates), which meant the income of his office for a year. If a vassal died without heirs, his property reverted to the lord (escheat), and might then be re-let to another vassal. If a vassal wished to surrender his fief to another, he had first to get the consent of his lord and pay a certain sum of money (fine upon alienation). If a vassal were guilty of treason, the lord might claim his possession by forfeiture. In England the king claimed, also, certain other rights, such as wardship and marriage, that is, if a vassal died leaving only children who were minors, the king became their guardian, and managed, and had the income from, their estates until they became of age. His consent to their marriage must be obtained, for which they were expected to pay well. One of the most oppressive rights of the lord was that of *fodrum*; that is, the maintenance of himself and retinue, or even his army, when passing through any district he might demand that its residents supply himself and his followers with food. In the same way, he might require the people along the way to furnish him a sufficient number of horses and waggons to transport him and his train from one place to another.

The rents due from the vassal were of various kinds. Generally a certain sum was due for the land, another for the house, sometimes another for the fire (chimney), and ordinarily a small tax for each head of stock (cattle, sheep, hogs, etc.). Of course the lord received a certain share of all that was produced on the soil—of the



wheat, hay, wine, chickens, stock, honey, beeswax, and, in fact, of everything. A charge was also made for the privilege of pasturing the stock in the forests or fields of the lord, for obtaining firewood from his forests, and for fishing in the streams which were regarded as his property. The peasants were forbidden to sell their grain for a certain length of time after the harvest, or their wine after the vintage, in order that the lord might have a temporary monopoly in these articles. They were compelled to bake their bread in his oven, grind their corn at his mill, and press their grapes in his winepress, for all of which a suitable toll in kind was charged. The lord could also seize the grain, wine, and other produce of his tenant, paying him what he chose, either in cash or at the end of a certain time. The tenant was required to labour also for his lord a certain number of days in the year. He must till his fields, care for his crops, make his wine, furnish horses and waggons on demand, haul his wood for the fires in the house, stones for building purposes, keep his castle and other buildings in repair, build defences, repair the roads and bridges, and render a multitude of other services.

The lord exercised over his tenants the power of a judge. All cases were tried before him or his officers. He had the right to impose and collect fines for all sorts of offences. For every crime and misdemeanour there was a fixed money penalty. The administration of justice on a great domain was, therefore, the source of a considerable income. The lord held court three times a year, at which all his vassals were expected to be present; but such attendance was soon felt to be burdensome, and they secured permission to absent themselves on the payment of a fee.

These are some of the most important rights of a feudal lord. It was to the lord's interest, of course, to multiply them and enforce them whenever possible. The vassals did all they could to limit them, and to preserve their liberty and independence. It is apparent, however, that the vassals were subject to innumerable burdens, and if their lord or his overseer were so disposed, their lives could be made unendurable.

The land was ordinarily divided into large estates, or domains, in the hands of what we may call great landlords, who, of course, did no work themselves. Very often they did not even oversee their estates, but *Disposition of the soil* left that work to the care of a foreman or agent. This office of agent often became a fief, but sometimes it was farmed out for a certain sum. The holder of it received no salary, but was expected to get his pay out of the administration of the office itself. This he did at the expense of the peasants. The central house, or manor of the estate, was regarded as the residence of the lord, although it frequently happened that he spent little time at it, especially if he possessed several domains. The manor was often the residence of the agent. About the manor was a considerable amount of land which was held by the lord and cultivated for his benefit. Since all his tenants owed him a certain number of days' labour, he never had any difficulty in having this land well cultivated.

All the rest of the tillable land and meadow, after being divided into small lots and parcelled out among the tenants, became hereditary in the family of the one who *Feudal* tilled them. These tenants lived, generally, in *society*, little houses grouped together, forming a village. All the inhabitants of the country were known as peasants (*rustici*, villeins), and may be divided into two classes, serfs and free. But within these two divisions there were many variations.

Feudal society may be divided into three classes, the peasants or tillers of the soil, the citizens or inhabitants of the towns, forming the industrial class, and the aristocracy, who lived upon the labours of the other two classes.

The slavery of the early empire had been changed into serfdom. The slaves had become attached to the soil which they tilled and were no longer sold. They were allowed to marry, and in accordance with the *Serfs*. prevailing feudal customs received a bit of land to till. At first the lord could tax his serfs at will, but gradually limits were set to the demands which he might make. The serf paid an annual poll-tax, and if he married some one belonging

to another domain he also paid a certain sum for the privilege of doing so. He could neither alienate nor dispose of his possessions by will, and at his death all that he had went to the lord. The serf could neither be taken from his land, nor might he leave it; yet many serfs ran away from their lords, and, passing themselves off for freemen, took service with other lords. If caught, however, they could be restored to their former lord; but if they could secure admission to the ranks of the clergy they thereby became free men. They might also become free in other ways. They might, if their master were willing, formally renounce him, surrender all their goods, and quit the domain. On the other hand, the lord might set a serf free on the payment of a certain sum. This became, indeed, a favourite way of raising money. The lord would set free all the serfs of his domain and demand the payment of the fee. Since they became his free tenants and must remain and till his land, he really lost nothing by setting them free, but rather gained. On the other hand, people might be reduced to serfdom by force. The character of free and servile had even become attached to the soil. Certain parts of a domain were called free, probably because they had always been occupied by free peasants, while other parts were called servile, probably because they had always been tilled by slaves who gradually became serfs. If a free peasant occupied this servile land he thereby lost his free character and became a serf. The free peasants were more nearly like renters who pay so much each year for the use of their lands either in money or in produce. Their lands were also hereditary. Being independent of their lord they could dispose of their possessions. There was nothing to prevent them from amassing a considerable amount of property.

In a later chapter will be found a description of the class of citizens. The cities themselves arose after the establishment of feudalism, but were forced into the feudal relations. They were, in fact, regarded as feudal personalities, and were treated much as a feudal individual.

*Citizens.*

The city, as a whole, owed feudal duties. As the cities grew large and rich, they resisted the feudal claims of their lords and were one of the powers that destroyed feudalism.

Sharply separated from the labouring classes were the nobility. This nobility was divided into two classes, the secular and the ecclesiastical. The only occupation of the secular nobility was the use of arms *Nobility.*

Only he could enter this class who had sufficient money to equip himself as a warrior and to support himself without work; for work was regarded as ignoble. It is probable that for centuries the acquisition of sufficient wealth enabled any one to pass into the ranks of the nobility. But in the thirteenth century nobility became hereditary. The line was sharply drawn between the noble and the ignoble families. Noble birth was added to the requisites of nobility, and eventually became the only requisite. Wealth alone was no longer the passport to noble rank. Intermarriage between nobles and commoners was forbidden, or at least regarded as a *mésalliance*. In Germany and France all the children born into a noble family inherited the title, while in England the title and wealth passed only to the eldest son. He only was required to marry within his class. The younger children might marry into ignoble families without thereby forming a *mésalliance*, a fact which accounts for the community of interest which has ever existed in England but not elsewhere between commoner and aristocracy.

From the tenth century it became customary to fight on horseback. Whoever was able to equip himself with a horse and the necessary armour was regarded as a member of the aristocracy of arms. Only the common people *Cavalry.* still fought on foot. From this use of the horse came the terms "chivalry" and "chevalier." Both man and horse were protected by armour in such a way that they were almost invulnerable. The knight wore for defence a helmet, coat of mail, and a shield, and for attack carried a sword and lance. Improvements and additions were constantly made in the armour, which gradually became so heavy that

the knight was almost helpless except on his horse. For ordinary purposes he kept a light horse, but for battle a strong animal was required because of the weight of the armour. Every knight was also attended by an esquire, whose duty it was to care for his horse and weapons and to serve as a body-servant.

Among this great body of men-of-arms there grew up a set of customs and ideas to which the name of chivalry was given.

*Chivalry.* It came to be regarded as a closed society into which, after certain conditions had been fulfilled, one could be admitted by initiatory ceremonies. Every young nobleman was required to learn the use of arms by serving an apprenticeship of from five to seven years. Generally he was attached to some knight, whom he attended everywhere, serving him in all sorts of ways. Such service, however, was not regarded as ignoble. At the close of his apprenticeship the young man bathed and put on his armour. His master then girded him with a sword and struck him with his hand on the shoulder, at the same time addressing him as knight. This is the earlier form of the ceremony. From the twelfth century on, the clergy added thereto many rites, all of a religious character. The candidate must also fast, spend a night in prayer, attend mass on the following morning, and lay his sword on the altar that it might be blessed by the priest, who then addressed him on his special duties as a knight.

The warlike character of the times showed itself in the dwellings as well as in the sports of the nobility. They dwelt in forts rather than in houses. Their castles were built in the places most easily fortified and defended. Ditches, moats, and walls formed the outer defences, while the castle itself, with its high lookout tower, made a stronghold which alone could endure a heavy siege. The sports of the nobility consisted principally of hunting, hawking, and the holding of tournaments. The tournament was supposed to be a mimic battle, but it often resulted fatally. At one tournament alone it is said that sixty knights were killed.

The Church was profoundly influenced by feudal ideas and customs. The whole clergy, the archbishops, bishops, and abbots, through their great temporal possessions, were drawn into the feudal relation. The Church taught not only that almsgiving was one of the cardinal virtues, but also that she herself was the fittest object on which it might be practised. Everywhere people give liberally to the Church, hoping thereby to secure the greatest possible intercession with God from the clergy. Monasteries, churches, and colleges of canons became rich from such gifts; *The high* in the course of centuries the clergy became *clergy*.

possessors of vast tracts of land and great privileges. Every abbot, bishop, and archbishop was therefore a landlord on whom the care of these great estates devolved. Because of their immense wealth, as well as the high honour attached to their calling, they also belonged to the aristocratic class, and ranked with the secular nobility. Since they were the most learned they were also used by the kings and emperors as counsellors and high officials. The great incomes of the monasteries and bishoprics made them especially attractive, and it early became the custom to put the younger sons of noble families into the best of such positions. These ecclesiastical lands, however, could not escape the feudal relation. The ruler of each country declared that all such lands owed him the customary feudal dues. Every bishop or abbot, on his accession to the office, became the king's vassal, and must take the vow of homage and the oath of fealty to him, and receive from him the investiture of the temporal possessions of his office. He must therefore perform, in addition to his ecclesiastical duties, also the civil duties which were required of other vassals. This dual character of the clergy was destined to become one of the principal causes of the bitter struggle between the empire and the papacy. It was impossible for the clergy to be faithful to two masters, both of whom demanded the fullest obedience.

Feudalism reached its height from the tenth to the

thirteenth centuries and then gradually declined. The invention of gunpowder revolutionized the methods of warfare. Against fire-arms, the knight's armour and castle were equally useless. The close of the Middle Age is marked by the rapid growth of the power of the kings, who succeeded in gathering the power into their own hands. The nobles were deprived of their authority. Out of the fragments of feudalism the king built up an absolute monarchy. The growth of the cities, also, did much to break down feudalism, for as they increased in power and wealth they wrested independence from their lords and threw off the feudal yoke. Various forces were at work to diminish the number of serfs and villeins, such as the crusades, the great pests, and the constant wars. The feudal lords were left without a sufficient number of tenants to do their work. The demand for labourers created the supply, and we find at once an increasing number of free labourers who work for wages without any feudal ties. Gradually feudal tenures were changed into allodial tenures. The fifteenth century saw the breaking up of feudalism, although in France and elsewhere certain fragments remained till the French Revolution, and the social organization of Europe is still largely feudal in its fundamental ideas.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE GROWTH OF THE PAPACY

#### LITERATURE.—See General Literature.

Moeller, *Church History*

Turner, *The Germanic Constitution.*

Milman, *History of Latin Christianity.*

Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*

Bury, *The Later Roman Empire*

Emerton, *Medieval Europe*

J. N. Murphy, *The Chair of Peter, or the Papacy and its Benefits*

Gregorovius, *The History of Rome* 5 vols

Stephens, *Hildebrand and his Times.*

DURING the first two hundred years of the Church's existence its actual organization was very loose. Each bishop was practically independent of all other bishops. But there was a steady development throughout the Church toward a closer union of all its parts. The magnificent political and civil organization of the empire furnished an excellent model, which was copied by the Church almost unconsciously. Corresponding to the political head of a province, there grew up an ecclesiastical official, whose authority extended over the province, and whose residence was its capital, that is, there was gradually developed above the bishops of a province an archbishop or metropolitan. The *Arch-* civil province thus became also an ecclesiastical *bishops.* province. The new office naturally fell to the bishop of the capital of the province. The Church followed the organization of the empire so closely that the ecclesiastical rank of the bishop was at first determined by the political rank of the city in which he lived.

As several political provinces were grouped together to



form a larger division (eparchy), so also several ecclesiastical provinces, with archbishops at their respective heads, were grouped together and formed a larger province, with an over-archbishop at its head. For this officer and his diocese the

*Patriarch.* word patriarch and patriarchate were used in the fourth century. The capitals of these patriarchates were Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Heraclea (which was early replaced by Constantinople), Corinth, Alexandria, and Rome. In the sixth century only five of these were recognized—Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Rome.

In tracing the growth of the papacy there are two things to be kept clearly separate: the development of the bishop of Rome as the head of the whole Church, and the growth of his power as temporal sovereign. These will be traced separately till the year 755, after which they will be treated together.

In the fourth century the bishop of Rome already had two offices: he was, first, the bishop of Rome, and, second, he was also archbishop or patriarch over the territory about Rome. We must discover how he added to these two a third, the office of bishop of the whole Church. Among the natural influences which helped bring this about may be mentioned the following:

*Conditions favouring the growth of the spiritual authority of the pope* The bishop of Rome was the only patriarch in the west, and he therefore had no competition. Since Rome was the capital of the empire, it seemed natural to think of the Church at Rome as in some sense the capital congregation, and its bishop the first bishop in the world. The analogy between him and the emperor would inevitably be drawn. The Church at Rome gave liberally for the relief of the persecuted and of the poor of other congregations. The bishop of Rome had charge of the disbursement of these funds, and received much of the reverence generally given to benefactors. The bishops of Rome were, for the most part, on that side of the great theological questions which was accepted by the whole Church,

and in consequence thereof the feeling arose that they alone of all bishops could be depended on to preserve the orthodox creed of the Church in all its integrity. The bishops and patriarchs in the east quarrelled, not only about the creed, but also about political questions. In their disputes they appealed so often to the bishop of Rome, that in the end he asserted that he had the right to judge between them. At the council of Sardica (343) it was proposed to make Julius, who was then bishop of Rome, judge in all cases where bishops who had been condemned by a council wished to appeal to a higher power. This action met with opposition because it was conferring on Julius a power which he had not previously possessed. The eastern bishops refused to accept it, because it was the act of a local synod, and therefore not representative of the whole Church. Although the honour was given only to Julius, his successors claimed the same right. The action of this council was, therefore, an important step in the development of the universal jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome. A council at Nicæa (325) took certain action which implied the equality of all the patriarchs (*i.e.* the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Heraclea). The council at Constantinople (381) decreed that the bishop of Constantinople, who had now replaced the bishop of Heraclea, should have the first place in honour and dignity after the bishop of Rome, because ~~Constantinople was~~ regarded as the new Rome or capital of the empire. This council merely fixed a matter of etiquette, saying only that the bishop of Rome possessed more official dignity and honour than the others. The Council of Chalcedon (451) admitted that the bishop of Rome was entitled to great honour because he was bishop in the ancient capital; but the bishop of New Rome was entitled to equal honour because he was bishop of the city in which the emperor resided and the Senate had its seat. Against this the bishop of Rome, Leo the Great (440-61), protested. He admitted that Constantinople was the capital of the empire, but declared that the political rank of a city did not determine the ecclesiastical rank of its bishop.

It is the apostolic origin of a Church that entitles it to a higher ecclesiastical rank. The Church of Rome, he declared, had been founded by Peter, the prince of the Apostles. To his successors Peter had passed on all his rights, dignity, and supremacy, so that as he was first among the Apostles, the bishops of Rome were first among all the bishops of the world. By virtue of being the successor of St Peter, Leo claimed the right to exercise absolute power over the whole Church. Leo was the first to give a clear-cut expression to this Petrine theory, which from that day to this has been regarded as the basis for the supremacy of the bishop of Rome.

Early in the sixth century Dionysius Exiguus, a monk of Rome, published two books, the one a collection of canons of the various church councils, the other a collection of letters, opinions, and decisions of popes on various matters. Dionysius treated the opinions of the popes as if they had as much weight as the action of the councils; and as these two works were widely used in the west, they helped raise the authority of the papacy.

While all the causes that have just been named contributed to elevate the pope to a position of supremacy, it was his success in Christianizing the barbarians in western Europe that assured him his position at the head of the Church. The bishops of Rome laboured for the conversion of the Arian Germans to the orthodox belief, and made a close alliance with the Franks when Chlodwig accepted the true faith. The Christianization of England through the efforts of Gregory the Great has already been described. These Anglo-Saxons, the pope's youngest converts, were the most zealous promoters of his interests. Through them the orthodox faith, one of the tenets of which was the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, was carried to Ireland, Scotland, and to all the German tribes on the main-land who were either heathen or only nominally Christian, and who acknowledged no allegiance to the bishop of Rome. An Anglo-Saxon princess, Queen Margaret of Scotland, toward the end of the eleventh century, subjected

*The popes  
carry on  
missionary  
work in the  
west.*

the Church of Scotland to the papacy, and made it conform in all respects to the Roman Catholic Church. Only the Irish Church, the Church of St Patrick, remained independent and yielded no obedience to Rome, till Henry II. (1154-89) conquered a part of Ireland and brought its Church into subjection to Rome.

In a former chapter attention was called to the missionary labours of Irish monks in Scotland and England. They did not confine their efforts to those countries. Many missionary bands, numbering generally thirteen persons, were sent to the main-land, and laboured among the Frisians and other German tribes, whose Christianity was only nominal. Their Church organization was very loose, and they were not attached to the bishop of Rome. The Irish missionaries found an ample field among them for all their activity.

*Irish missionaries on the Continent.*

It was a West Saxon, Winifred, or Boniface, as he was later called, who was to re-organize the Church among all the Germans, and subject it to the bishop of Rome. *Boniface*, He was born about 680, was brought up in a 680-755 monastery, and ordained a priest when about thirty years old. In 718 he went to Rome and received from the pope a commission to Christianize and Romanize all the Germans in central Europe. For nearly five years he travelled through Germany, from Bavaria to Frisia, in the prosecution of his work. In 723 he again went to Rome, and was made a missionary bishop without a diocese, at which time he took the same oath to the pope which was required of the bishops in the diocese of Rome. Practically, therefore, the pope regarded Germany as a part of his diocese, and as closely attached to him as were the districts about Rome.

From Karl Martel, and after him from Pippin, Boniface obtained support in his work. He received supplies of both men and means from England, and was able to establish in Germany many monasteries. In 743 he was made archbishop of Mainz. He called councils, at which the work of organization was perfected, heresies refuted, a superstitious

rites and customs forbidden, the lives of the clergy regulated, his opponents condemned, and the authority of the bishop of Rome acknowledged.

In 753 he resigned his position as archbishop of Mainz, and went again, with a large number of helpers, as a missionary to Frisia, where he met a martyr's death (754 or 755). But the principal part of his work was done. He had organized the Church throughout Germany and subjected it to Rome. It was from this Church of Germany, now truly dependent on Rome, that Christianity was to be carried to the remaining German tribes, such as the Saxons, Danes, and the people of Scandinavia, and to the Slavic peoples to the east of the Elbe. In this way the doctrine of the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, which had become a part

*The Roman  
Catholic  
conquest of  
the west*

of the Roman creed, was spread throughout all Europe, and was regarded as an essential part of Christianity. This movement may be called the Roman Catholic conquest of the west, for it was a conquest, the outcome of a policy, the full results of which could not be foreseen by the popes of that time.

The work of Boniface has been variously judged. He has been exalted as the apostle of the Germans and condemned as the enslaver of the German Church. At that time the choice was, in reality, between subjection to Rome and heathenism. Boniface chose the former, because it was most certainly the best thing to do. The Church among the Franks and Germans was in a wretched condition. Much of the landed property of the Church was in the hands of laymen. There was little or no discipline, and no control exercised over the clergy. Each priest did what was right in his own eyes. There were, at this time, many vagabond priests and monks wandering about over the country, obtaining a precarious living by imposing upon the people. There was also much heathenism among the people. Such a state of affairs was little better than heathenism pure and simple, and such Christianity, such a Church, would certainly be unable to maintain the Franks

*An estimate  
of his work.*

in the leading position they were now holding Boniface put an end to this disorder. He forbade all monks to leave their monastery without sufficient reason. The wandering clergymen were put under the control of the bishop of the diocese in which they might be found. Strict discipline was everywhere introduced into the monasteries. All monks were compelled to live according to the rule of St Benedict. Laymen were forbidden to hold church property. In a word, the Church was reformed, and a much better type of Christianity was established among the Franks. This was the work of Boniface and deserves praise and admiration.

The growth of the temporal power of the papacy is, in some respects, even more difficult to trace. We have to discover how the pope acquired political power, first, the civil authority in Rome and its duchy, and then the temporal headship over the whole world.

From the time of Constantine the bishops were intrusted with an ever-increasing amount of civil power. They acted as judges, they were guardians of morals, they had the oversight of magistrates and a share in the government of the cities. To these the bishop of Rome added still more important powers, and was easily the most important man in Rome. He bitterly resented the right, claimed and exercised by the emperors at Constantinople, to dictate to him in ecclesiastical matters, and was finally so angered by their haughty treatment of him that he was ready to revolt. The image controversy gave him the desired opportunity. When the emperor, Leo III, forbade the use of images, pope Gregory II replied that it was not the emperor but the bishop of Rome who had authority over the beliefs and practices of the Church. Gregory III. (731-41) even put the emperor under the ban.

*Growth of  
the pope's  
temporal  
power*

In his struggle with the Lombards the pope appealed first to Karl Martel and then to Pippin, visiting the latter in 753-54, and begging him to come and deliver him from their encroachments. Pippin made two campaigns into Italy, and

compelled the Lombards to cede to the pope a strip of territory which lay to the south of them (755). *Beginning of the papal state, 755.* This marks the beginning of the temporal sovereignty of the pope. He was freed from the eastern emperor, and recognized as the political as well as the ecclesiastical ruler of Rome and its surrounding territory, under the overlordship of Pippin, who had the title of *patricius*.

We have seen that the pope took the final step in his revolt from the eastern emperor by crowning Karl the Great emperor. He persuaded Ludwig the Pious to allow himself to be recrowned by him. In 823 he crowned Lothar emperor, and later his son, Ludwig II. By this long line of precedents the pope so completely established his claim to confer the imperial crown that it was not seriously questioned for centuries.

Thus far, in discussing the growth of the papacy, we have not taken into account the personal element. Such men as *Makers of the papacy.* Leo I., Gregory I., Gregory II., Gregory III., and Nicholas I. (858-67) have, with great justice, been called makers of the papacy, because of their activity in *Nicholas I., 858-67.* formulating and advancing the papal claims. Nicholas I., especially, was a man of great force, and made himself felt through all parts of Europe. Throughout his pontificate he acted on the theory that he was responsible for the conduct of affairs in the whole empire. He did not wait for questions to be brought to him, but considered it his duty to take the initiative whenever he discovered anything wrong. Under Nicholas the papacy possessed more influence and power than ever before, and under none of his successors did it reach so high a plane until the appearance of Gregory VII.

For a while in the tenth century, indeed, it seemed that the papacy was to be destroyed by the local political factions of Rome. *The papacy in the hands of factions.* The political character of the office made it a thing to be coveted by all the great families of the city. The dignity of the office was dragged

through the mire of the ward politics of Rome, it was controlled by infamous women and filled by licentious men. Its political character overshadowed its religious character, and the popes forgot that they owed any duty to the outside world. Otto I., Otto III., and Henry III. rescued the papacy from its perilous position, freed it from the control of the Roman nobility, and reminded the popes that they were the head of the whole Church and not simply officials of Rome. During the eleventh century the papacy, keeping well in mind its former world-wide claims, grew steadily in self-assertion. The Cluniac reform was spreading, and its ideas were gradually taken up by the popes, and their policy shaped in accordance with them. In the council of Pavia (1018) Benedict VIII. forbade the marriage of the clergy. Simony, the obtaining of office in any other way than by a canonical election, was also forbidden.

*The papacy reformed by the emperors reasserts itself.*

Henry III. made and unmade popes, and treated them as subjects who owed him obedience. Toward the end of his reign, however, Leo IX. (1048-54) exhibited a spirit of independence in his government which portended the coming storm. He was appointed by Henry III., but refused to accept the office until he had been elected by the people and clergy of Rome. He travelled incessantly throughout Italy, France, and Germany, holding councils, settling disputes, and regulating affairs with a vigour and independence born of his authority as pope. He went one step farther in the question of simony. Every bishop in the empire was not only a clergyman, but also, by virtue of his office, a kind of political official of the emperor. That is, he was compelled to perform certain civil duties. He was, besides, a feudal subject of the emperor, and as such owed him homage for the church lands, which he held. The emperor, of course, received certain taxes or income from all the lands in the empire, whether owned by the Church or by laymen. No bishop could be inducted into his office until he had taken an oath of allegiance to the emperor and been



invested by him with the episcopal lands. The pope had no part either in his election or his investiture or induction into office. Leo IX. saw the disadvantages of this to the papacy and its dangers to the Church, and in the Synod of Rheims (1049) asserted the right of the pope to invest the bishops with the insignia of office. He made no attempt, however, to enforce it.

*The question of investiture broached.*

Gradually the papal theory was working out into all its logical conclusions. The popes were slowly perceiving how vast were the opportunities offered them. The vision of universal dominion floated less dimly before them. The questions at issue between the papacy and the empire were being stated with more precision. The conflict *at hand.* was ready to break out. There were wanting only the opportunity and the man to make use of it. The opportunity came when Henry III. died, leaving a boy only six years old to succeed him, and the man was Hildebrand, a papal official, but already at Henry's death the power behind the throne. As fate would have it, the pope was made the guardian and protector of the boy-king.

## CHAPTER X

### THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE (1056-1254)

LITERATURE.—See Chap. IX. See also General Literature for Church  
Histories and Epochs of Church History Also—

Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*.

Emerton, *Medieval Europe*

Thatcher and Schwill, *Europe in the Middle Age*.

Vincent, *Age of Hildebrand*.

*Biographies of Bernard*, by Storrs, Morison, Neander, Eales, and Ratisbonne.

Henderson, *History of Germany in the Middle Ages*

Testa, *Wars of Frederick I. Against the Communes of Lombardy*.

Compayré, *Abtlard, and the Origin of Universities*

Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*.

Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy*.

Browning, *Guelphs and Ghibellines*, 918-1273.

Zeller, *Histoire d'Italie*, and

*Histoire d'Allemagne*.

Dante, *De Monarchia*, translated by Church.

Duffy, *Tuscan Republics*.

THE accession of Henry IV., a mere boy, to the throne of Germany, gave the papacy the opportunity for which it had been waiting. Since the reform of Henry III. (1046) the papacy had been rapidly gathering power. Hildebrand, the adviser of several successive popes, had been able to direct all their efforts toward the same end. The pontificate *Nicholas II.*, of Nicholas II. (1059-61) was made famous by the alliance which he made with Robert Guiscard and by the publication of a decree fixing the manner of the election of the pope. Up to this time there had been many and great irregularities in the papal elections. In theory the pope was elected by the clergy and people of Rome; but the factions in the city had many times controlled the election, and the emperor had

often named the pope. Hildebrand clearly saw that the elections must be taken from the control of the people. In accordance with his ideas, Nicholas, in a council (1059), proclaimed a decree that the seven cardinal or titular bishops of Rome should in the future have the sole right to nominate the pope, and their nominee must be accepted and elected by the clergy of Rome. The people were to have no part in the election, and the emperor probably had the right to confirm, but not to reject, the pope thus elected.

"Cardinal" was a title given to the clergy attached to the oldest and most important churches of Rome and its vicinity. The churches in Rome itself were all under the bishop of Rome, and were ministered to by presbyters and deacons. There were cardinal presbyters and cardinal deacons, who were, of course, attached to the principal churches. There "Cardinal," were seven cardinal bishops, who formed a kind of council to the bishop of Rome, had charge of the affairs of the diocese when he was absent from the city and assisted him in all great functions; and to these seven the sole right of nominating the pope was now confided. They were the bishops of Palæstrina, Porto, Ostia, Tusculum, Candida Silva, Albano, and Sabino. This was the beginning of the formation of the College of Cardinals. The decree was an important step in the process of freeing the papacy from all temporal control.

In Germany this decree was rejected, because it did not recognize the rights of the emperor. A council of German bishops actually deposed Nicholas, and at his death elected an anti-pope. The empress Agnes became regent, but her inability to administer the government led to the kidnapping of the young king and the establishment of the archbishop of Cologne as regent, the government then assumed a more conciliatory attitude toward the new pope, Alexander II., and eventually recognized him.

In 1065 Henry IV. was declared of age, and took up the reins of government. He had exceptional talents, and if he had received better training and possessed sufficient moral earnestness, might have had a far different

history But he hardly appreciated his position. He had no thought of a reform, and spent his time in the chase or with his mistresses, to enrich whom he robbed churches and sold offices. He was imperious and insolent, and the great dukes were soon alienated from him. Saxony, deeply offended by his conduct, was ready to revolt. At last, in 1069, a crisis was reached when he proposed to divorce his wife. The diet refused to consent to this step, and formal complaints were made against him to Alexander II. The pope excommunicated his council and summoned him to Rome. The death of the pope, which occurred shortly afterward, put an end to the strife for a brief time.

Hildebrand, who, during several pontificates had been the power behind the throne, was now made pope, it would seem by a popular demonstration. Apparently the decree of Nicholas was disregarded in that the cardinal bishops did not nominate the candidate. The people demanded Hildebrand for their bishop and the clergy of Rome elected him. He assumed the title of Gregory VII. Hildebrand was not personally ambitious; his conduct as pope was determined by his theory of that office. He

*Gregory VII., 1073-85.*

was not a theologian; in defending one of his friends he almost incurred the charge of heresy. A practical man of affairs, he had served the curia principally by looking after its secular interests. He was a diplomat and politician, obtaining by artifice or well-timed concessions what was otherwise unattainable. He made use even of heretics, if they could be of service to him. He could make compromises in everything except in the question of the supremacy of the papacy.

Till this time the empire had been regarded as the kingdom of God on earth, and the emperor as its head. Gregory declared this idea to be false. The empire could not be the kingdom of God because it is based on force. On the other hand, the Church is based on righteousness and can do no wrong. Gregory's fundamental position was, therefore, that the Church is the kingdom of God, and the pope who is at its head has absolute authority over all the world.

*Which is the kingdom of God, the empire or the Church?*

Gregory's practical genius told him that the Church must be a compact unit, thoroughly organized and completely under the control of the pope. The unity of the Church could be

*Necessity of  
a central  
power in  
the Church.*

secured only by concentrating all the power in one man. The Church must obey one will. This would be possible only when one creed and one liturgy were everywhere accepted, and when all the clergy were bound directly to the head of the Church, the

*Bishops take  
oath of allegi-  
ance to the  
pope.*

bishop of Rome. He therefore required all bishops to take an oath of allegiance to him similar to that which vassals rendered to their lords. He gave all the clergy the free right of appeal to himself, and encouraged them to make use of it. This, of course, diminished the power of the bishops and raised his own accordingly.

*Appeals.*

He replaced the authority of synods by assuming the right to decide all questions, either in person or through his legates. His legates played much the same part in his government that the *missi dominici* had under Karl

*Papal  
legates.*

the Great. They were to oversee for him all the affairs of the state to which they were sent, control the action of synods, and bind all the countries to the pope. They were to be his hands and eyes. He definitely assumed control over the councils by declaring that he could act without the advice of councils, and that their acts were invalid until sanctioned by him. He was supported in this by several writers on church law, whose controlling principle was the absolute authority of the pope, and who, developing church law in accordance with Gregory's ideas, attributed more authority to the decrees of the pope than to the action of councils.

From the very first Gregory put his theory into practice. In 1073 he wrote to the Spanish princes that the kingdom of

*Gregory  
VII. and  
the temporal  
rulers.*

Spain had from ancient times been under the jurisdiction of St Peter, and, although it had been occupied by barbarians, it had never ceased to belong to the bishop of Rome. In 1074, in a letter to Solomon, king of Hungary, he claimed that country on the ground that it had been given and actually transferred to St Peter by king Stephen. He made the same claims to

authority over Russia, Provence, Bohemia, Sardinia, Corsica, and Saxony. He made the duke of Dalmatia his subject, and gave him the title of king. France, he said, owed him a fixed amount of tribute. He laid claim to Denmark, but its king resisted him successfully. He wished William the Conqueror to hold England as his fief, and William, though refusing to acknowledge the pope as his feudal lord, yet consented to make the payment of the Peter's pence binding on England.

In a council at Rome (1075) Gregory forbade the marriage of the clergy, as well as simony in all its forms. He threatened to excommunicate all bishops and abbots who should receive their offices from the hand of any layman, and every emperor, king, or temporal ruler, who should perform the act of investiture. This was a hard blow at all rulers, but especially *The struggle with Germany.* at the emperor, because the German clergy were his principal support and were the holders of large tracts of land. If the pope should be successful in carrying this point, the power of the empire would be almost destroyed.

The pope further cited Henry (December, 1075) to appear at Rome and explain his conduct in keeping at his court certain men whom Gregory had excommunicated, and threatened him with the ban if he should refuse to come. Henry regarded this as a declaration of war, and answered it with defiance. At the council of Worms (January, 1076) he charged the pope with having obtained the papal dignity by improper means, and declared him deposed.

The war was begun. Gregory could count on the support of the Normans in Southern Italy, the popular party in Lombardy, Matilda, the great countess of Tuscany, *Gregory's allies.* the Saxons, the discontented nobles of Germany, and that rapidly increasing class of people all over the empire who were becoming imbued with the ideas of the Cluniac reform.<sup>1</sup> Henry had for his support a large number *Henry's allies.* of his faithful subjects who remained uninfluenced by the action of the pope, a large part of the clergy who were

<sup>1</sup> Between 927 and 941, a movement for the reform of Christendom was started by the Monastery of Cluny. A moral, intellectual, and ecclesiastical reformation was aimed at. See page 161.

patriotic but probably guilty of simony, and the imperial party in Italy.

Henry's letter of deposition (January, 1076) to Gregory was bold and vigorous. He declares that he had endured the misdeeds of Gregory because he had wished to preserve the honour of the apostolic throne. This conduct the pope had attributed to fear, and had, therefore, dared threaten to deprive Henry of the royal power, as if this had been received from him, and not from God. Henry had received his office through the Lord Jesus Christ, while Gregory had obtained the papal power without God's help. The steps by which he had mounted to the throne were cunning, bribery, popular favour, and violence. While seated on the throne of peace he had destroyed peace. He had attacked the king, God's Anointed, who, by the teaching of all the holy fathers, could be judged and deposed by God alone. The Church had never deposed even Julian the Apostate, preferring to leave him to God's judgment. The true pope, Peter, had commanded all to fear God and honour the king, but Gregory has no fear of God. Let him, therefore, vacate the throne of St Peter. Henry, with his bishops, pronounces the anathema upon him. Let another occupy the papal throne who will not cloak his violence under the name of religion. Henry, with his bishops, orders Gregory to vacate the throne at once.

The reply of Gregory (February, 1076) was equally imperious and vigorous. He calls on Peter, Paul, and all the saints to witness that he had unwillingly accepted the papal office thrust upon him by the Roman Church. This was sufficient proof that the Christian world had been committed to him. Relying upon the help of St Peter and God, he therefore deposes Henry, because, in his unspeakable pride, he has revolted against the Church, and he absolves all his subjects from obedience to him. Because Henry persists in his claims and disobedience to the pope Gregory excommunicates him. He expects that St Peter will make his anathema prevail, in order to make the world know that he, Peter, is the rock on which the Church is built, and that the gates of hell cannot prevail

against it. This was, indeed, a new language in the mouth of Gregory. No pope had ever made such claims or spoken in such a tone to the emperor before. For the first time the claim is openly made that the empire is a dependency of the Church.

Encouraged by the action of the pope, the dissatisfied nobles of Germany held a meeting at Tribur (October, 1076), to which they did not admit the king. After some resistance, Henry was compelled to accept the terms known as the Oppenheim agreement which this meeting dictated to him. He agreed to remain in Speier and make his peace with the pope before the end of February of the following year; to lay aside all the royal insignia, which was equivalent *Henry IV.* to resigning his kingship, and to present himself *deposed.*

in February, 1077, in Augsburg, and submit to trial before the council, which was to be presided over by the pope. Nothing could have been more acceptable to Gregory than to come to Germany and preside over a national council and try the king; but Henry had no intention of permitting this to take place. Gregory indeed set out for Germany, but while waiting for an escort through Lombardy, was alarmed at the news that Henry had escaped from Speier, had crossed the Alps in the dead of winter, and was already in Lombardy, where he had been received with every mark of affection by the people. Being in doubt whether Henry's intentions were hostile or peaceable, Gregory withdrew to the Castle of Canossa to *Canossa.* await developments. Henry soon informed him

through friends that he had come to make peace and to receive absolution. The pope refused to receive him, and demanded that he return to Germany and present himself at Augsburg, according to the agreement which he had made with his barons. After much beseeching, however, the pope yielded, admitted Henry to his presence, and removed the ban from him.

Henry had been deeply humiliated, but he had accomplished his purpose; he had been freed from *Henry* the ban of excommunication, and had thereby *outwits* deprived his rebellious subjects of all show of *Gregory.* legality; and he had robbed Gregory of the best part of his



victory by preventing his coming to Germany to preside over the national assembly. Gregory had, on the other hand, shown his power by keeping an emperor standing as a penitent at his door. The emperor never wholly recovered from this humiliation, but the pope had in reality overshot the mark. The people thought him too severe and unforgiving. Although the world regarded the immediate victory as Gregory's, it was really Henry's, for from this time Henry's power increased and Gregory's diminished.

It soon became apparent that Henry had been insincere in his confession and promises. He had plotted against Gregory even on the way to Canossa, and as soon as he reached Germany he began to plan for his self-defence. His enemies, principally Saxons and Suabians, continued their opposition to him. The war dragged on for years, during which time the pope deserted him and put him under the ban, and two anti-kings were set up against him. By the greatest good fortune, however, Henry was eventually victorious in Germany. He then set up an anti-pope and invaded Italy in order to depose Gregory. After three years of fighting he took Rome, had himself and his wife crowned, and besieged Gregory in

the Castle of San Angelo. Gregory, in the mean-  
*Gregory VII. driven from Rome Dies, 1085* while, had summoned his faithful subject, Robert Guiscard, who now appeared with a large force, drove off Henry, rescued the pope, and gave Rome over to his Norman troops to be pillaged. The people were so angry at this outrage that Gregory did not dare remain longer in the city. He withdrew with his Normans to the south, where he died, in 1085, in Salerno.

Gregory had made great claims without being able fully to realize them. He had made concessions to William the Conqueror, and to Philip I. of France, who both still possessed the right of investiture. Henry IV. had, in many respects, held his own against him. Gregory's legates in Spain were abused; he himself died in exile. But he had established the custom of sending papal legates to all parts of Europe; he had put his own authority

*The work of Gregory VII.*

above that of a council; he had destroyed the independence of the bishops by giving to all the clergy the free right of appeal to the pope; he had made the celibacy of the clergy the rule of the Church, and he had freed the papacy from all lay interference, whether imperial or Roman, by establishing the College of Cardinals. In a word, he had formulated the claims of the papacy to absolute power and marked out its future policy.

Urban II. (1087-99) was able to carry the war to a successful conclusion. He added Bavaria to his allies, and persuaded Lombardy to desert Henry. Even Henry's son, Conrad, was false to his father, and joining the *Urban II.* papal party, for his perfidy was made king of Lombardy. In 1094 Urban II. celebrated his victory by making a triumphal journey through Italy and France.

The last years of Henry IV. were made bitter by the revolt of his second son, Henry, who made war on his father and compelled him to resign. But as soon as he came to the throne Henry V. (1106-25) broke with the papal party, took up his father's counsellors and policy, and renewed the struggle with the pope. After several attempts to make an agreement, the question was temporarily settled by the concordat of Worms (1122). Its terms are as follows: The

emperor concedes to the pope the right to invest the clergy with spiritual authority, which was symbolized by the ring and the staff; on the other hand, bishops and abbots are to be canonically elected in the presence of the emperor or of his representative, but contested elections are to be decided by the emperor, and the emperor is to invest the clergy with their lands and all their civil and judicial functions. The symbol of this investiture, which was the same as that of the counts and other laymen, was the sceptre.

*The  
Concordat  
of Worms,  
1122.*

Henry V. renewed the policy of Otto the Great toward the barbarians on the eastern frontier by encouraging the missionary efforts of Otto, the bishop of Bamberg, through whose zeal the Slavs of Pomerania were converted and Germanized.

The opposition which he met from his nobles led him to try to win the favour of the cities of the empire, which were rapidly growing strong and rich, in order to set them over against the nobility. He seems to have recognized in a dim way the power and importance of the citizen class, and to have endeavoured to make it his ally. At the death of *Lothar the Saxon*, 1125-38 Henry V. Lothar, duke of Saxony, was elected to succeed him. He owed his election to the fact that he made favourable terms with the papal party and agreed to act in accordance with the interests of the Church. He even wrote to the pope, asking him to confirm his election.

In 1130 a double papal election took place, which threatened to disrupt the papacy. One of those elected, Innocent II. (1130-43), went to France, where he won the support of Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, then the most influential man in Europe. Through the influence of Bernard, Innocent obtained the favour of the kings of both France and Germany. *Lothar and Innocent II* many, Lothar, of Germany, even going to Italy, and by arms establishing Innocent in Rome. As a reward, Innocent crowned him emperor and invested him with Tuscany. By accepting this fief, Lothar became the pope's feudal subject. The pope evidently wished to make his victory over the emperor seem as great as possible, and, taking advantage of Lothar's yielding disposition, caused a picture to be painted representing the emperor kneeling at his feet, and receiving the imperial crown at his hands. It was intended that this picture should express the idea that the emperor was receiving the imperial crown as a fief from the pope.

Roger II., of Sicily, had sold his services to the anti-pope, Anaclete II., on condition that he should be made king. After Innocent had made himself master of Rome, Roger continued his opposition, and Innocent called on Lothar to reduce him. *Sicily becomes a kingdom*, 1130, recognized by *Lothar*, 1139. Lothar's campaign ended disastrously, however, and the pope was compelled to make peace with Roger and confirm his title of king.

At the death of Lothar Conrad of Hohenstaufen was elected

in a very irregular way as his successor (1138-52) *Frederick I*, however, utterly unable to rule the country *Conrad II*. Although the disorder in the kingdom was growing, 1138-52 Conrad permitted himself to be persuaded to go on a crusade. During his absence from the country, violence private war, and political disintegration increased. He returned in 1149, and added to the chaos of the period by beginning a war with his most powerful vassal, Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony. His reign ended in disaster.

His nephew, Frederick I, known as Barbarossa, was then elected king (1152-90). Since he was descended from the two rival houses of Bavaria and Suabia, known respectively as Guelph and Ghibelline, it was hoped that 1152-90 he would put an end to the enmity and struggle between them. It was not the fault of Frederick that he did not do so. He sought to conciliate his opponents in every way. He restored Bavaria to Henry the Lion, favoured him in other ways, and really left him no grounds for dissatisfaction except *His two* that he was not king. Frederick may be said to *policy* have had two policies, one as king of Germany and the other as emperor of the world. He tried to make Germany a state by unifying the government, and repressing all violence and oppression. As emperor, his one ideal was to restore the ancient Roman empire. The great Roman emperors were his models. In the eleventh century there had begun a revival in the study of Roman law, and Frederick now pressed it into his service. He surrounded himself with men who were versed in the codex of Justinian, and from these he received the imperial ideas which he tried to realize in his empire. These lawyers were impressed with the spirit of absolutism in the Roman laws, and chose such maxims to lay before Frederick as would increase his feeling of sovereignty. They told him that the will of the prince was law, and that the emperor was absolute sovereign of the world. The absolutism of Frederick was not the outcome of a lust for personal power, but the logical product of his conception of his office.

In 1154 Frederick crossed the Alps into Lombardy, and

pitched his camp on the famous Roncaglian plain. A diet was announced, and the cities of Lombardy were ordered to send their consuls to meet him. Most of the cities did so, but Milan and some of her allies refused to obey. There was at that time a struggle going on between the smaller cities and Milan, who had been acting very tyrannically. Pavia appealed to Frederick against Milan and Tortona, and when Tortona disregarded his commands, he besieged and destroyed it. Milan itself was, for the time being, spared, since Frederick's attention was called to Rome.

The people of Rome had not forgotten that their city had once been the mistress of the world. They were restless under all control, whether imperial or papal. They longed for the ancient power and independence of the city, and had dreams of restoring her to her former proud position. This was the cause of their frequent opposition to the popes. The papal supremacy was incompatible with their political ideas and aspirations. In 1143 the common people and the inferior nobility revolted, drove out the pope, and restored what was considered the ancient government of the city.

Two years later the priest Arnold of Brescia came to Rome, and soon became the most influential person in the city. He had been in France, and having heard the theories of the great heretic Abelard, had adopted them, and wished to put them into practice. The revolution in Rome (1143) seemed to offer him the coveted opportunity, so, filled with burning zeal, he hastened thither. His programme was somewhat extensive. His sympathies were with the common people as against the nobility. He was filled with the idea which had cropped out at various times in the Church, and was soon to become a central reforming principle of St. Francis, *i.e.* the sinfulness of property. He declared that the land should not be held by the rich, but should be common property. Every one had the right to the use of a certain amount of land. Since individual possession is sinful, the Church, of course, should be without property. But he went a step farther, and declared that the individual also should

live in poverty. He attacked the clergy for their crimes and worldliness. It was to him a mark of the deepest corruption of the clergy that they had so great a share in the administration of civil affairs "Clergymen with property, bishops with regalia, and monks with possessions could not be saved." The Church needed a thorough reform, and the beginning should be made with the pope Arnold demanded that the Church should give up all her possessions and live in poverty, which, he said, was the law of Christ Fired by his preaching the mob began to sack the monasteries. If it was wrong for the clergy to have property, they ought to be deprived of it at once!

In 1154 Nicholas Breakspeare, the only Englishman who has ever occupied the chair of St Peter, was elected pope, and took the name of Hadrian IV. He boldly took up the struggle with the republican party in the city He got possession of the Vatican quarter, and intrenched himself there. He put the city under the interdict, and removed it only when Arnold was exiled. By losing Arnold, the city lost its best leader

It was at this juncture that Frederick Barbarossa came into Italy. The pope went to meet him, made charges against Arnold, and demanded his death. The republican party also sent an embassy to Frederick to tell him that the people of Rome were the source of imperial power and were willing to make him emperor if he would take an oath to respect the rights of the city and her officials, and pay them a large sum of money. Frederick was enraged at their insolence, and told them that Karl the Great and Otto I. had acquired the imperial title by conquest; Rome's power was a thing of the past; her glory and authority had passed to the Germans; it was not for a conquered people to dictate terms to their master. Hadrian IV., however, was willing to make better terms with Frederick. He agreed to crown him emperor on condition that Frederick restored him to his place in Rome and delivered Arnold into his power. Frederick was thereupon crowned, and the city was reduced to subjection.

Arnold having been taken prisoner, was, at the command of Hadrian, burned at the stake as a heretic

The relations between Frederick and Hadrian had not been altogether satisfactory. At their first meeting Frederick had refused to hold the stirrup of the pope because, as he said, it was not the custom for the king to do so. Hadrian was enraged at this, and would not give Frederick the kiss of peace. The quarrel was finally patched up, but only temporarily. The claims of pope and emperor were so conflicting that there could be no lasting peace between them

The Besançon episode showed the temper of the two parties and indicated the speedy outburst of the storm. Archbishop  
*The Besançon episode,*  
 1157. Eskil of Lund had been in Rome, and while on his return homeward through Burgundy was seized, robbed, beaten, and imprisoned. Although Frederick was informed of this, he made no attempt to set him free or to punish those who had committed the outrage. One reason for this indifference on Frederick's part was to be found in the fact that Frederick was angry at Eskil because he was supporting the ambition of the Scandinavian Church to become independent—an ambition at the bottom of which was, of course, national feeling. For, up to this time, the Church of Scandinavia had been subject to the archbishop of Hamburg, being regarded as a part of his diocese. Through this ecclesiastical influence, Frederick hoped to gain political authority in Scandinavia, and so enlarge his empire. Eskil being thus in the way of Frederick's ambitious plans could not count on his protection. Frederick also wished to show his displeasure with the treaty which had just been made between the pope and William of Sicily, in which the emperor's rights had been entirely disregarded. While Frederick was at Besançon (October 24-28, 1157) two legates appeared from the pope bearing a letter in which the emperor was roundly rebuked for his neglect to set Eskil free and punish his captors. When they first presented themselves before Frederick they delivered the greetings of the pope and the cardinals, adding that the pope

greeted him as a father, the cardinals as brothers. This form of salutation was regarded as strange, but was not resented by Frederick. On the following day they were formally received by the emperor, and laid before him Hadrian's letter. After rebuking Frederick for his indifference, the pope confesses that he does not know the cause of it. Hadrian feels that he has not offended in any respect against Frederick, on the contrary, he has always treated him as a dear son. Frederick should recall how, two years before, his mother the Holy Roman Church, had received him, and had treated him with the greatest affection, and, by gladly conferring upon him the imperial crown, had given him the highest dignity and honour. "Nor are we sorry," he continued, "that we fulfilled your desires in all things; but even if your Excellence had received greater fiefs (*beneficia*) from our hands, if that were possible, in consideration of the great services which you may render to the Church and to us, we should still have good grounds for rejoicing." The reading of the letter produced a stormy scene. Never before had the empire been thus openly called a fief of the papacy. The princes about Frederick angrily remonstrated with the legates for making such claims. To this one of them replied by asking, "From whom then did the emperor receive the empire, if not from the pope?" The question almost cost him his life, for the hot-blooded Otto von Wittelsbach rushed upon him and would have slain him but for the interference of the emperor. The legates were ordered to return at once to Italy, and were not permitted to proceed farther on the business of the pope.

Whether Hadrian meant that *beneficium* should be understood as fief or not is really of small consequence. The important thing was that he plainly treated the imperial crown as if it were something entirely within his power to give or to withhold. This was little less offensive to Frederick than the word fief, because it was his belief that the imperial crown was attached to the German crown. The king of Germany had a right to the imperial crown, the pope merely had the right to crown him.



Frederick then published a manifesto to his people, recounting the claims of the pope as contained in the letter, and in opposition to these declared that he had received the imperial crown from God alone through the election by the princes. Jesus had taught that the world was to be ruled by two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. Peter had commanded that all men should fear God and honour the king; therefore, whoever said that the empire was a fief of the papacy was opposed to St Peter and guilty of lying.

Hadrian IV. then wrote an open letter to the clergy of Germany, expressing surprise and indignation at the turn affairs had taken. It was a most diplomatic letter, written for the purpose of winning the German clergy to his side. Some of them, however, were true to their emperor, and wrote Hadrian a letter, in which they embodied the answer of Frederick. It was of the same tenour as his manifesto, and claimed that the empire was not a *beneficium* (fief) of the pope, but that Frederick owed it to the favour (*beneficium*) of God. Frederick was also still angry about the picture which the pope had had made representing Lothar on his knees receiving the crown from the pope. The pope, he said, was trying to make an authoritative principle, basing it simply upon a picture. Hadrian now wrote a letter to Frederick in which he explained that "*beneficium*" was composed of "*bonum*" and "*facio*," meaning not "fief," but a "kind deed" or "favour." By "*contulimus*," "we have conferred," he had meant only "*imposuimus*," "we have placed," that is, the crown on Frederick's head. Hadrian succeeded in quieting Frederick, but the battle was not ended, it had been merely put off.

Frederick next turned his attention to the cities of Lombardy, which for a hundred years or more had been left to take care of themselves. They had improved the time by developing an independent municipal government. Milan was first reduced. It was agreed, however, that the city should continue to elect its officials, but that the emperor

should have the right to confirm them. Another diet was announced to be held in the Roncaglian plain, and the cities were ordered to send their officials to it. It was Frederick's wish to break down the independent spirit of the cities. It was during his stay in Italy that Frederick had come into contact with the lawyers of Bologna, and learned from them the leading ideas of Roman law. Ancient customs were revived, and Frederick renewed his claims to the regalia (that is, to the duchies, counties, marches, the office of consul, the right to coin money, collect taxes, customs, duties, etc.). He declared that in the future all the important officers of the city would be appointed by him and the people should approve them. Representatives of all the cities helped to frame the rights of the emperor and agreed to observe them. He then proceeded to put this agreement into force. He sent his representatives throughout the country to establish in every city his officials. The people of Milan asserted that, by virtue of a former compact with the emperor, the Roncaglian agreement did not include them. They therefore resisted the emperor's messengers and closed the gates of the city against them. Refusing to recognize their claims, Frederick laid siege to the city (April, 1159), which held out nearly three years. In February, 1162, it could resist no longer. The people tried in every way to appease Frederick, but he remained deaf to their entreaties. The walls of the city were razed, the inhabitants driven out, and many of the nobility kept as hostages.

*The second  
Roncaglian  
Diet.*

*Milan  
destroyed,  
1162.*

In the meanwhile the quarrel had broken out afresh between the pope and emperor. In 1159 Hadrian made sweeping demands of Frederick in regard to the possession of the lands of Matilda, the collection of feudal dues by Frederick from the papal estates, and the full sovereignty in Rome. The emperor, of course, refused these demands, and the pope prepared for the struggle. Seeking help from Roger of Sicily, and from the Greek emperor, he intrigued with the cities of Lombardy.

*Hadrian  
makes  
fundamental  
claims.*

In 1159 Hadrian died, and the cardinals thereupon elected the man who had acted as spokesman of Hadrian at Besançon, *Alexander* Roland Bandinelli, who assumed the name of *Alexander III*.

*Alexander III*. He now took up the quarrel and spent his time endeavouring to find allies. Frederick, however, set up an anti-pope, and was so successful in his opposition to Alexander III. that the Pope was compelled to leave Rome and seek a refuge in France (1161). Frederick seemed to have won the day. His officials were in all the cities; Milan was destroyed and the pope an exile. But his very success was the cause of his defeat; he had borne himself as an emperor of the old school. His absolutism was tyranny to the cities, and hence they were eager to find some way of avenging themselves. Alexander III put himself at the head of the opposition. In 1165 he returned to Rome, excommunicated the emperor, and released his subjects from their oath of allegiance to him. Alexander was a diplomat; he was hostile to the independence of the Lombard cities, but because they could help him he sought their alliance. For nearly fifteen years this able man led the opposition to Frederick, and the final victory over the emperor was due in a large measure to his ability and efforts. The next year (1166) Frederick went again into Italy with a large force to punish the rebels and to put the new anti-pope, Paschalis, in the chair of St Peter. After a siege he took Rome. Paschalis was established as pope, and a few days later recrowned Frederick and his wife in St Peter's. A pest broke out shortly afterward, and Frederick, alarmed at the great mortality among his troops, hastened back to Germany. As fast as he retreated the cities behind him revolted; he barely escaped with his life. The cities now entered into the famous

*The  
Lombard  
League,  
1167.*

Lombard League (1167). Milan, rebuilt by the aid of them all, assumed the leading position in the league. Pavia still remained true to the emperor, and to keep it in check, the league founded a new city on the border of its territory, and named it Alexandria in honour of the pope. It was not till 1174 that Frederick was

in a position to re-enter Italy. Then the emperor himself laid siege to Alexandria while some of his troops overran Tuscany and Umbria. Alexandria was very strong, and the siege lasted for months. Overtures of peace were made, and, as winter was approaching, Frederick withdrew to Pavia. Again and again he called on the German princes to come to his assistance, but Henry the Lion thought it an excellent opportunity to humble the emperor, and refused to assist him. In May, 1176, the troops of the league attacked Frederick *Legnano,* at Legnano, and won a decisive victory. It was 1176.

even thought for a while that the emperor had lost his life in the battle. Frederick realized the situation; he had been beaten; he was therefore ready to make peace on the cities' terms. He met Alexander III in St Mark's at Venice (1177), fell at his feet, confessed his wrong deeds, and begged the pope to remove the ban from him. The pope yielded, and a truce was declared. Six years later, at Constance, the *The Treaty of Con-* treaty of peace was signed which granted the cities *stance, 1183.* substantially all that they had demanded. The overlordship of the emperor was recognized, but it was merely nominal, and the independence of the cities was practically admitted. It was a bitter humiliation for Frederick, but he could not escape it. Being pressed in Germany by the Guelf family, he needed the support of the pope, and there was nothing for him to do except to abide by the decision dictated by the outcome of the war.

A crisis was reached in the struggle between the Ghibelline and the Guelf families in 1176, when Henry the Lion refused to help Frederick in his war against the Lombard League. After returning to Germany, Frederick proceeded to punish him. He cited Henry to appear before him, and on Henry's refusal, deposed and banished him. Henry resisted, but was defeated in battle, and begged for mercy. Frederick stripped him of his power, but generously permitted him to retain his private estates.

Although Frederick had not been able to conquer Sicily, he provided for its annexation by marrying his son, Henry

VI., to Constance, heiress to the crown of that country. The pope foresaw that this marriage would greatly strengthen the empire, and that the emperor, by holding Sicily and southern Italy, could easily attack the papal lands whenever he chose. Unwilling that the emperor should gain so great an advantage over him, the pope determined to prevent the proposed union of the Sicilian kingdom with the empire. He accordingly renewed hostilities and engaged the archbishop of Cologne and other discontented German nobles in a conspiracy against Frederick. In the meantime the news reached the west that Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of the Saracens, and, according to the ideas of the times, its recovery was regarded as the most pressing business of the hour. The papacy was willing to make almost any concessions if it could enlist Frederick for a crusade. *The Crusade of Frederick I.* An agreement was made in which Frederick seemed to have won the victory. He was now ready to go on the crusade. He placed the management of affairs in Germany in the hands of Henry VI., who took the title of king of the Germans. Frederick set out in the spring of 1189, but did not reach Palestine. He died by drowning in one of the mountain streams of Cilicia, June 10, 1190.

In Italy Alexander III. had found that, although he had overcome Frederick, he had not won the whole victory for himself. *In Italy the sports divided.* He was unable to unite all Italy under his own authority. The cities of Lombardy and the kingdom of Sicily secured their own advantages and went on their way of independence. During the struggle with Frederick there had been several anti-popes established by the emperor. The schism thus caused was ended in 1178 by the surrender of Calixtus III., who found it impossible to sustain himself after the emperor had made peace with Alexander. To guard against disputed elections in the future, it was decreed in the Lateran synod of 1179, that whoever should receive the votes of two-thirds of the cardinals should be regarded as the duly elected pope. There was nothing said about the emperor's right to confirm the election, nor

was any part accorded the people and clergy of Rome. From this time the whole matter is in the hands of the cardinals.

Alexander III deserves great credit from the papal point of view for the work of his pontificate. His power was recognized all over the west as that of no pope before him had been. His immediate successors were unable to maintain all the advantages he had won. Before the end of the century Innocent III,

*The high position of Alexander III.*

the most imperial of all the popes, was to appear, and realize all that previous pontiffs had dreamed of; but before him there was to be another struggle in Rome. The independent spirit of the people of the city reasserted itself, and Lucius III (1181-85) and Urban III. (1185-87) spent most of their pontificates in exile. Clement III. (1187-91) succeeded in regaining the mastery in Rome, and all power was made over to him. The pope had seldom been so secure in the city before. But a new danger was threatening. The marriage of Henry VI. with Constance of Sicily might, at any moment, lead to the establishment of the imperial power in the south, and the addition of Sicily and all the southern part of Italy to the empire. The pope would then be between two fires

The first days of the reign of Henry VI. were filled with anxiety. Henry the Lion broke his royal word and attacked Henry VI. as soon as Frederick had set out for *Henry VI.*, the east. The news of the death of William, king 1190-97. of Sicily, soon reached Germany, and a few days later the sad news of the death of Frederick was received. Henry VI made peace with Henry the Lion, made provision for the government in Germany during his absence, and hastened into Italy. He was crowned at Rome and went on to Sicily to secure the possession of that kingdom; but the people of Sicily had elected a certain Tancred to be king, and Henry was unable to accomplish anything there. The outlook was indeed dark, for there were powerful enemies allied against him. The combination of Richard the Lion

Heart of England, the Guelph family in Germany with Henry the Lion at its head, and Tancred in Sicily would probably be able to break the power of the Hohenstaufen. This danger was averted by a series of fortunate occurrences. Richard was taken prisoner on his way home from his crusade and delivered into Henry's hands. The son of Henry the Lion fell in love with a cousin of the emperor, and in order to obtain her hand, made peace with him. Henry the Lion, now an old man, discouraged by the submission of his son to the emperor, gave up the struggle and retired to his estates, and Henry VI was able in a second campaign to get complete possession of Sicily.

The fears of the pope proved to be well-founded. In fact but little sagacity was necessary to see that the imperial and *Bold plan of* papal claims were so mutually conflicting that force *Henry VI* alone could settle them. The emperor's opportunity seemed to have come. Relying on his strength, Henry VI determined to enforce his claims without any regard for the pope. He seized the lands of Matilda (Tuscany), for which the pope put him under the ban; but not in the least frightened by this, Henry continued his efforts to get possession of all Italy. He is said at this time to have planned the complete destruction of the papal state by adding it to his own territory. He also turned now to try his fortune in the east. He planned a crusade, the real object of which was first of all the conquest of Constantinople. The Greek empire was, indeed, in a chaotic condition, and he hoped to win its crown and establish himself in Constantinople, from which vantage-point he might easily carry on the war against the Saracens. He went first to Sicily in order to put down a revolt and punish those who were hostile to him, intending then to proceed against Constantinople, but died in Messina after a very brief illness (1197), leaving a son, Frederick II., only three years old. His great plans and hopes were destroyed, and the empire was thrown back into the anarchy caused by a contested imperial election. At the same time

Innocent III. became pope, a man of strong will and great ability, full of theocratic ideas and the desire to realize them.

Innocent III. (1198-1216) was probably the ablest pope of the Middle Age. He was a jurist, trained in the schools of Paris and Bologna. He looked at everything from the jurist's point of view, and endeavoured to reduce to a legal form and basis all the claims of the papacy. Not personally ambitious, he was fully persuaded that in everything he did he acted in accordance with the best interests of the Church, and even with the plans of God. He was ambitious merely to make of the papacy that which he believed God had appointed it to be. He believed that the government of the world was a theocracy, and that he himself was the vicar of God on earth. He pushed to the extreme the ideas of the supremacy of the papacy over all rulers, and actually realized them in many respects. His programme may be summed up under the following heads: 1. The pope must be absolute master in Italy, which must therefore be freed from the control of all foreigners, hence the empire must not be allowed to unite any part of the peninsula to itself; the papal state must be strengthened; the political factions in the city must be kept in subjection. 2. All the states of the west must be put under the control of the papacy; neither king nor emperor may be independent of the pope, but must submit to him in all things. 3. The Church in the east, and the Holy Land must be recovered from the Moslems, and the Greek Church purified of its heresy and reunited to the Church of the west; all heretics must be destroyed; the law and worship of the Church must be made to conform to papal ideas.

The imperial claims of Henry VI. are here answered by the papal programme of Innocent III. It is apparent that their radical contradiction could permit no reconciliation. Neither party could get all that it demanded without the practical destruction of the other. For the present the conflict could be postponed because of the disputed imperial

*Innocent  
III., 1198-  
1216, and  
his pro-  
gramme.*



election But the situation was wholly in favour of Innocent, and he determined to make good use of his opportunities.

In Sicily the young king, Frederick II, was among enemies, and when his mother died, Innocent was made his guardian.

*Innocent and his ward.* He performed his duties toward the boy with great conscientiousness, supplying him with the ablest teachers, giving him the best education possible, caring for his interests in Sicily, and protecting him against his rebellious subjects

In Germany there was a contested election, which Innocent was asked to settle. Philip of Suabia, after trying in vain to secure the election of his nephew, Frederick II., was himself made king by a large number of princes. The Guef family, however, elected one of their number, Otto IV. *Philip of Suabia, 1198-1208, and Otto IV., 1198-1215.* Innocent III. decided in favour of Otto, because, as he said, Otto was the proper person for the office, and was devoted to the Church, while Philip was a persecutor of the Church. Philip had declared that he would defend his claim to all the possessions of the empire, while Otto IV. had taken an oath that he would not interfere with the papal claims, but would defend all the possessions of the papacy. Civil war ensued. After defeating Otto and making himself master of Germany, Philip was murdered (1208), and Otto, being now without a rival, was recognized throughout Germany

Otto IV., however, now that he had secured the crown, changed his policy toward the pope, broke his oath, and demanded Sicily and Tuscany, on the ground that they were parts of the empire. He was successful in arms in southern Italy, but before the conquest was completed the pope had raised a revolt among the German princes and put forth Frederick II. as a candidate for the German crown. *Frederick II., 1215-50.* At the invitation of some of the German nobles, Frederick, although a boy, went to Germany, made an alliance with Philip, king of France, and in three years made himself undisputed master of Germany.

Innocent III followed out his policy with great vigour

Frederick held Sicily as a fief of the papacy. In central Italy, Innocent made a league with the cities, drove out the emperor's officials, and established his own in their place. The king of Portugal acknowledged his authority and paid him tribute, the king of Aragon became his feudal subject, and the king of Leon was compelled to yield obedience to him. In Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Servia, and in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, Innocent was able to make good his claims, at least in part. In France, Innocent interfered in the family affairs of the king, compelling him to take back his wife, whom he had divorced on insufficient grounds. In political matters, however, Philip II. resisted the demands of the pope with more or less success. In England Innocent compelled John to accept Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury, and then aided the king in his struggle against the barons.

*Success of  
Innocent  
III.*

It seemed for a while that the papacy would get possession of all the Christian east. Innocent III. forbade the fourth crusade to proceed against Constantinople, but when the city was taken and the Latin Church established there he accepted its work. From Constantinople as a vantage-ground, he hoped to extend the papal authority over all the east, but the rapid disintegration of the Latin empire of Constantinople was destined to blast his hopes.

*The east.*

During his pontificate many heresies appeared in the west, the most widely-spread of which was that of the Albigenses. Innocent and his successor were responsible for the crusade which was preached against them, and carried out by Simon de Montfort. In 1215, at the Lateran council, the inquisition was established, and it was declared that heresy was a crime which should be punished with death. At the same council the doctrines of transubstantiation and auricular confession were promulgated. The twenty-first canon of that council declared that every Christian must confess his sins to the priest at least once a year, and might receive the sacrament of the eucharist after doing so. If he did not confess, the Church was to be

*The Lat-  
eran Coun-  
cil, 1215*

closed to him, and if he should die, he should not receive Christian burial. "From that time forth the confessional began to be considered as the only means of obtaining forgiveness for mortal sin, which the priest, as representative of God, actually granted, and he alone could grant." The doctrine of transubstantiation, which, up to that time, had not been the universal belief of the Church, was adopted, and it was decreed that no one except a properly ordained priest could administer the sacrament. Innocent had announced that the council would deal with two questions, the recovery of the Holy Land and the reform of the Church. Many of the canons were really reformatory in their character, and the work of the council dealing with all sorts of questions shows the deep insight and sincerity of Innocent. A great crusade was announced for the year 1217, and immense preparations made for it, but Innocent did not live to see it. He died at Perugia while busily engaged in preparing for the crusade.

On the surface his pontificate seems to have been a success. He had apparently won a victory in every case over the temporal powers. But he had alienated the affections of the people. The cruelty of the crusade against the Albigenses turned the whole of southern France against him. His victory over John of England, and the support he gave him in his struggle against his people, filled the English with hatred of him. In Germany the same results were reached. The troubadours charged their songs with fearful arraignment, and Walther von der Vogelweide lashed the papacy for its worldliness, its greed of money, and its ambitions. Innocent gave the fullest expression to the political claims of the papacy, and did much to realize them. Under his guidance some of the most important doctrines, rites, and practices of the Church were established. The formation of the code of canon law, while not begun by him, was thoroughly in accordance with his ideas, and it gave a legal form and basis to what he had claimed. It would not be too much to say

*The character of the papacy changed*

that he was the last great maker of the papacy. His programme was carried through with the appearance of remarkable success, but his best weapon, the interdict, was almost worn out by its too frequent use. The forces were at work which were soon to undo all that he had done. The papacy lost in spiritual power under him because he made politics the principal matter. Earnest Christian pilgrims and visitors at Rome were shocked to hear nothing about spiritual matters, but to find the mouths of all the clergy incessantly filled with talk about temporal affairs.

The greatest of the popes was followed by the greatest of the emperors. In 1212 Frederick had set bravely out to take Germany from Otto IV. He renewed the alliance with Philip of France, and the German princes of the Rhine valley received him with favour. Seeing the danger, Otto IV. called on his allies for help. John of England sent an army to the continent to unite with the count of Flanders, the duke of Brabant, and other nobles in the north of France against the French king. The decisive battle was fought near Bouvines, in July, 1214, and resulted *Bouvines*, in the complete victory of Philip II. Since his *1214* allies were thus disposed of, Otto IV was compelled to yield to Frederick. He withdrew to his lands, and died at Harzburg (1218).

Frederick was crowned at Aachen in 1215, proclaimed a universal peace in Germany, and took a vow to go on the crusade which Innocent III was planning. His next step was to secure the imperial crown. But Innocent was *Frederick II. and the papacy.* afraid of his growing power, although Frederick had been most respectful to him in all things. He feared that if Frederick should hold both Germany and Sicily, the two would be joined together, and Frederick would try to control all Italy. He therefore persuaded Frederick to promise that as soon as he should receive the imperial crown he would resign the crown of Sicily to his young son, Henry, who should hold it as a fief from the pope. Death prevented Innocent from crowning Frederick, but Innocent's successor, Honorius

III., performed the act Frederick, however, in spite of his promise, retained the title of king of Sicily, a breach of faith to which Honorius III. paid no attention, because he was desirous that the crusade should be made, and he wished Frederick to join it. Frederick, however, always found excuses, and put off his departure. He married Iolanthe, the daughter of the king of Jerusalem, and without any regard for the rights of her father assumed that title himself. Gregory IX. (1227-41) demanded his immediate departure for Palestine. Frederick finally sailed (1227) from Brindisi, but returned three days later, and excused himself on the ground that he was ill. Gregory would not listen to the excuse, and put him under the ban. Frederick then made fresh preparations for the crusade, but the pope forbade his going until he had obtained the removal of the ban. Frederick, however, sailed again from Brindisi, June, 1228. Arriving in Palestine, he saw that by force it would be impossible to conquer the east, yet by diplomacy he gained possession of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, and other places for the Christians. He crowned himself in Jerusalem, and returned home, having been three times excommunicated for his disobedience to the pope.

During his absence the pope had tried to stir up the Germans against Frederick II., and, raising an army at his own expense, had attacked the emperor's territories in the south, achieving some success. But when Frederick returned (1229), the pope, taken by surprise, was unable to continue the war, and offered to make peace. The two came together at San Germano, 1230. Germano (1230), and by mutual concessions peace was restored.

Frederick then turned his attention to Sicily. In 1231 he published the famous "constitutions of the kingdom of Sicily," by which feudalism was destroyed there, and a real kingship established in its stead. Royal judges and courts took the place of the barons and their courts; feudal dues were replaced by direct taxes, and other changes were made which resulted in the formation of a

really modern state in all that concerns the machinery of government

During his long absence from Germany great disorder had arisen. He had caused his son Henry to be made king in Aachen (1222), and much power had been granted him. In 1233 Henry revolted against his father, but was seized and carried to Italy, where he died as a prisoner (1242). In a great diet at Mainz (1235) Frederick forbade private warfare, proclaimed the peace of the land, and ended all the quarrels between him and the Guelf family by making its last representative a duke and investing him with a large duchy, created especially for him. He was now at the height of his power, having Germany and Sicily wholly in his hands

The struggle between the papacy and the empire which, with more or less acuteness, had now been in progress for more than one hundred and fifty years, had accumulated a great deal of bitterness on both sides. A peace had often been patched up between them, but the real question at issue had never been decided. There could not be two absolute rulers of the world. So long as each claimed supremacy and tried to rule the other, there could be no lasting peace. Frederick felt that he was now strong enough to settle the question by force. The possession of Sardinia, which had lately been declared to be a fief of the Church, furnished a convenient pretext for renewing the contest. In 1238 Frederick laid claim to Sardinia as a part of the empire, and began to take possession of it. The pope protested, but in vain. Frederick persisted in his course, and the pope, from this time on, was implacable in his hatred of Frederick. The final struggle had begun. Gregory IX. and his successors freed the German princes from their oath of allegiance to Frederick, and tried to turn the people against him. The cities of Italy were arrayed against him, and help was sought from France. At the same time, in order that all Christians might turn from him with horror, Frederick was charged with all kinds of heresy. He was reported to have said that there had been three great religious impostors who

*Frederick  
II. renews  
the struggle.*

had deceived the world—Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed, he had reviled the clergy and the creed of the Church, he had said that nothing is to be believed which is not acceptable to the reason. Heresy was proved by the fact that he associated with both Jews and Mohammedans, and allowed the free exercise of all religions in his kingdom. The emperor defended himself with great vigour. He had recourse to the Apocalypse of St John for his figures of speech, and called the pope the anti-Christ, the angel that came up from the bottomless pit, and the rider on the red horse with power to destroy peace in the world. Gregory called a council, but Frederick captured the clergy who were on their way to attend it, and thus prevented its meeting. He overran Italy, and got possession of the territory even to the gates of Rome. After the death of Gregory IX the cardinals were unable to elect a pope, and for nearly two years the chair of St Peter was vacant. Frederick tried in every way to compel them to elect his candidate, but they resisted him successfully. At last, in 1243, one of Frederick's friends was elected, and took the title Innocent IV. (1243-54). Frederick, however, felt that the war must go on, because, as he said, no pope could be a Ghibelline. Innocent escaped to France and called a council at Lyons, at which the emperor was again deposed and put under the ban. All were forbidden to regard him as their king, or emperor: the princes of Germany were ordered to proceed to the election of another king, Innocent said that he himself would take care of Sicily. To this Frederick replied, asserting that he was a good Christian, and that he had been labouring all his life only to bring the clergy to live in the proper way, and to lead an apostolic life in poverty and humility.

Victory seemed to be almost within Frederick's grasp, but Innocent IV. did not think of surrendering. In the hope of retrieving his lost fortunes, the pope redoubled his energies. He appealed to France, to the cities of Italy, and to the Germans, and by the greatest exertions kept the war going. He turned it into a crusade, and offered to all who would join

in it the same indulgences and spiritual rewards as against the Saracens. In 1246 he succeeded in having count Henry Raspe of Thuringia elected king in place of Frederick. Civil war spread all over Germany.

*A Crusade  
against the  
emperor.*

The Begging Friars supported the pope by stirring up the people against Frederick, and by collecting large sums of money from all quarters to be used in carrying on the opposition. The pope persuaded the electors to make William of Holland king (1247). Frederick's son, Conrad IV., who, as king of the Germans, had charge of affairs in Germany, was unable to resist the progress of William, who was crowned at Aachen in 1248. Misfortunes thickened around the aging emperor. Among the courtiers of Frederick a conspiracy was formed, and an attempt was made to poison him. His son Enzo was taken prisoner and confined in Bologna. One by one his friends and supporters fell in battle. He himself was very ill, but he kept up his courage. His troops were victorious in Italy, and Rome was about to fall into his hands. The struggle was far from being decided when the emperor died (December 13, 1250).

*Death of  
Frederick  
II., 1250*

Frederick II. was of the Middle Age, and belonged at the same time to the Modern Period—a man full of contrasts, not to say contradictions. He was most modern in that he was not controlled by religious, but wholly by political, motives. He was not bound by feudal ideas, but actually created an absolute monarchy in Sicily.

*His  
character.*

His kingdom there is regarded as the first modern state in Europe. He persecuted heretics in Germany, but was himself very free in thought, tolerating all religions in his kingdom of Sicily. He was not a German in character, but exhibited the fusion of the German, Italian, Greek, and Saracen elements in southern Italy. He spoke Latin, Italian, French, German, Greek, and Arabic. In culture and learning he surpassed all the emperors who had preceded him, was himself a poet, and kept himself surrounded by poets and scholars. He established the University of Naples (1224).



He had zoological gardens, not for the gratification of his curiosity alone, but also for scientific purposes. He belonged to the class of independent thinkers of which Abelard was also a member. He preferred to live in Sicily, because it possessed far more culture than Germany. He understood the question at issue between himself and the pope; he knew that it was for the right to rule the empire independently that he was fighting. In the art of diplomacy he was well-trained, and by it won many victories. He died before the struggle was ended, but he seems to have felt that it would be decided against him and his family. His last years were made heavy by many misfortunes, but he died with unbroken spirit.

With the death of Frederick II. the power of the Hohenstaufen family was broken, but the fight was not given up. *Conrad IV*, Against William of Holland Conrad IV., son of 1250-54, Frederick II., was unable to maintain himself in and William of Germany, and so withdrew to Sicily, which his half-brother, Manfred, had succeeded in holding for him. Conrad IV. offered to make terms with the pope, but all his advances were rejected. Innocent IV. was implacable. He had sworn that the hated race of the Staufen should be literally destroyed. Conrad and Manfred were, however, successful in arms, and in spite of all opposition had got control of southern Italy and Sicily, when Conrad IV. died suddenly (1254), leaving his little son, whom the Italians call Conradino, to the care of his faithful Manfred. After continuing the struggle for four years, Manfred was compelled to accept the crown himself (1258), but he stipulated that Conradino should succeed him.

The pope now turned to France for help. He offered the crown of Sicily to Charles of Anjou, the brother of king Louis IX. This Charles was bold, ambitious, and utterly unscrupulous. In 1263 the kingdom of Sicily was made over to him, and he began his preparations to take possession of it. Manfred tried to besiege Rome and to keep Charles from landing in Italy. He was unsuccessful,

however, and Charles entered Rome and was crowned king, January 6, 1266. About a month later the decisive battle was fought near Benevento, and when Manfred saw that he was betrayed by many of his troops, who, no doubt, had been bribed to desert to Charles during the battle, he rushed into the thick of the fight and was slain.

Conradino, who had spent all his life in Germany, was a genuine Hohenstaufen. Although a mere lad, he gallantly responded to the call of the Ghibellines of Italy, and with a small army came down from Suabia to meet Charles of Anjou. After a hard-fought battle, Charles was victorious. Conradino was taken prisoner and beheaded as a rebel in the public square of Naples.

The long battle was over, and the victory was the pope's. Not only was the power of the Hohenstaufen broken, the family itself had been destroyed. There remained only one member of it, Enzo, the son of Frederick II., and he was a prisoner in Bologna, where he died, in 1272. The great Staufen family was no more. With it had disappeared the empire of Karl the Great. Not that it was destroyed, but it now underwent a radical change. The government of the world was no longer the peculiar prerogative of the emperor, but of the pope. The pope had vindicated his right to the temporal as well as to the spiritual supremacy, and it was now possible for him to declare with truth that he was both pope and emperor.

When Conrad IV. left Germany in 1251, William of Holland remained in full possession. The pope did all he could to obtain William's recognition throughout Germany, but for some time in vain. The cities in the Rhine valley renewed the old league (1254), and within a year there were more than sixty cities bound together for mutual protection. Eventually they recognized William, as did nearly all of northern Germany. But becoming engaged in a quarrel with the Frisians, he was killed by some Frisian peasants.

(January, 1256). Although both Richard of Cornwall and Alphonso of Castile were afterward elected king, neither of them was able to establish himself as master of the country. Alphonso, indeed, never came to Germany. Richard visited the country, but never exercised any authority there. The period from 1254 to 1273 is known as the great interregnum.

During this struggle of the Staufen with the papacy, two things are to be noticed. the largely increased number of principalities and the extension of the frontier to the east. Through the policy of the Hohenstaufen to diminish the power of the dukes by breaking their original provinces up into many smaller political divisions and giving these as fiefs to others, there had now come to be, instead of the five great stem-duchies, a large number of duchies, counties, marches, bishoprics, and other principalities, all striving for independence. The influence of subinfeudation may also be seen in this dissolution of the great political units.

A most important change had taken place in the eastern boundary. Slowly the Slavs, Letts, and Magyars, who covered the whole eastern frontier, had been conquered and were being Christianized and Germanized. The eastern boundary had been carried, even beyond the Vistula on the Baltic, and included the valley of the Oder, from there it extended in an irregular line to the Danube below Vienna. Germany had lost Italy for ever, but had indemnified herself in a measure by the conquest and assimilation of these barbarian lands.

Great progress had been made in Germany in culture and wealth. Numerous cities were in existence, and they were now ready to make use of the freedom afforded them by the absence of a strong ruler to establish among themselves their powerful independent leagues.

The struggle between pope and emperor resulted in the political dismemberment of both Germany and Italy. While

the feudal lords of Germany had got power there the cities of Italy were growing in independence, and the French had got a good foothold in the southern part of the peninsula. The unhappy country seemed farther than ever from unity.

## CHAPTER XI

### MONASTICISM

LITERATURE — See Church Histories in General Literature.

Mrs Oliphant, *St Francis of Assisi*

Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*

Harnack, *Monasticism Its Ideals and its History*

Jessopp, *Coming of the Friars*

*St Benedict's Rule*, translated in Henderson, *Documents*

Penn. Univ. *Translations*, Vol II

Kingsley, *Hermits*

Eckenstein, *Woman under Monasticism*

Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*

Taunton, *English Black Monks of St Benedict from the Time of St Augustine to the Present*

Montalembert, *Monks of the West* 6 vols

THE philosophic basis of asceticism is the belief that matter is the seat of evil, and therefore that all contact with it is contaminating. This conception of evil is neither Christian nor Jewish, but purely heathen. Jesus freely used the good things of this world, and taught that sin is in nothing external to man, but has its seat only in the heart. But his teaching was not understood by his followers. This belief that matter is evil had its origin in the teachings of certain heathen philosophers. It not only pervaded all philosophic thought, but in the second century of our era had even become the common creed of the masses. It had so firm a hold on them that Christianity was not able to dislodge it from their minds. The people already attached a religious value to ascetic practices, and in their excess of religious zeal, when they became Christian, they were naturally inclined to increase their ascetic observances. The peculiar form which this asceticism in the Church took is called monasticism.

The decay of the empire, which set in strongly in the second century, and the violence consequent upon the invasions of the barbarians, robbed many persons of interest in life. The world seemed to be growing old, and the end of all things approaching. The best men were filled with despair, and longed to hide themselves away from the increasing confusion and desolation. After about 175 A.D. the Church rapidly

*Conditions favourable to the introduction of asceticism into the Church.*

grew worldly. As Christianity became popular, large numbers entered the Church and became Christian in name, but at heart and in life they remained heathen. The bishops were often proud and haughty, and lived in a grand style. Those who were really in earnest about their salvation, unsatisfied with such worldliness, fled from the contamination in the Church, and went to live in the desert, and find the way to God without the aid of the Church; her means of grace were for the common Christians. Those who would, could obtain, by means of asceticism and prayer, all that others received by means of the sacraments of the Church. There were to be two ways of salvation. one, through the Church and her means of grace; the other, through asceticism and contemplation

*Two ways of salvation*

The beginnings of monasticism are lost in obscurity. They fall very probably in the third century. The earliest monks were hermits. They lived alone, finding all the shelter they needed in a hut, or in a cave, or in the

*Hermits.*

shadow of some rock or tree. The movement beginning in those countries where the conditions were favourable to such an outdoor life, spread rapidly throughout the east. In order to protect themselves against impostors and other dangers, the hermits began to build their little huts close together, and probably surrounded them by a wall for protection. They had a common chapel, and on certain days worshipped together and ate of a common meal. Though they had few rules, they elected a sort of superior

*Semi-social organization.*

to be over the whole colony. Gradually they came to live in houses, in which each monk, having his own room or cell,

maintained a certain amount of independence. In this way the ascetic life was organized on a semi-social basis. By going into the desert, the hermit, of course, had given up his possessions and his family, and it soon came to be regarded as a matter of course that he had taken the vows of poverty and chastity. When they began to live under one roof another vow was necessary—that of obedience or subjection to the rules and interests of the house.

More and more this loosely organized cenobitic life became the common form, retaining, although the monks now lived together, the name of monasticism. It is this form of monasticism that has prevailed in the Greek Church, although hermits still exist there, and are regarded as leading a more holy form of life. The monks of the Greek Church have really lived for the most part separated from the world. Occasionally they have made themselves felt at the court, and they have played a part in the great synods held during the fourth to the eighth centuries. Since that time monasticism in the Greek Church has had no history, because it has had no life. The monasticism of the Greek Church has helped to preserve the dead forms in the Church, but has prevented any change except in the direction of enriching the ceremonies and forms of worship.

Monks were first seen in the west about 340, when Athanasius brought two of them with him to Rome. They excited among the Romans feelings of mingled curiosity and disgust. But when Augustine and Jerome gave the influence of their pens and their example in favour of monasticism, it spread rapidly throughout Europe. The movement became immensely popular, and within a century and a half there were hundreds of monasteries in the west, and thousands of monks in them. It seemed for a time that this monasticism in the west would be of the same character as that in the east, and therefore would have no history and play no part in the work of the Church. But the spirit of the west took hold of it, organized it, and made it one of the most effective tools in the hands of the pope and

*Three vows*

*Monasticism  
in the  
Greek  
Church.*

*Monasticism  
carried to  
the west.*

emperor to Christianize and civilize the barbarians and extend the Church and the state. The Roman spirit of organization, of conquest and activity, would not allow the original monkish ideal to prevail. The monks had, indeed, fled from the world, but they were to be used to conquer and to rule it.

At first each monastery made its own rules of discipline, each monk was allowed to act almost as he pleased. There were several attempts made to harmonize these rules into one common code. Of these attempts only that of *Benedict of Nursia* (480-543) was destined to *Nursia, 480-543*.  
 Benedict, after spending several years as a monk in various places went to Monte Casino, near Naples (528), and taking with him several of the monks who had been associated with him elsewhere, he founded the famous monastery of Monte Casino, for which he prepared his Rule. He organized the monks into a close corporation, forbidding any of them to leave the monastery without the consent of the abbot. A clear line was sharply drawn between them and the world. The occupations of the monks were fixed by him for every hour of the day and night. Periods of prayer and contemplation were to alternate with seasons of work. Strict discipline was to be enforced, and all monks must take the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience.<sup>1</sup>

Circumstances favouring the spread of Benedict's rule, it was gradually adopted by other monasteries. Gregory the Great (590-604) established it in many places in Italy, Sicily and England. In the seventh century it was much more widely used, and in the eighth, under Boniface, it was made the only form of monasticism in Gaul and Germany. In the next century, Benedict of Aniane helped give it a severer character. It became the orthodox rule of monasticism, and at one time governed more than forty thousand monastic establishments. Benedict's intention was not to make his monks either scholars or missionaries. The bishops of Rome, however, used them in missionary work, and that soon came to

<sup>1</sup> Henderson, "Historical Documents of the Middle Ages," p. 274 ff., contains a translation of this rule



be regarded as one of the peculiar purposes of their existence. It was principally through them that Christianity spread among the barbarians; Cassiodorus, the prime minister of Theodoric the Great, remained in public life till about 540, when he retired to a monastery which he had founded in Calabria. There he gave himself to literary pursuits, and likewise required his monks to spend a certain portion of time every day in study. This example was imitated in other monasteries, and since it soon became apparent that a good deal of learning was necessary to manage the monastery's affairs, some of the monks in each monastery became scholars. In this way learning found a home in monasteries.

The rule of St Benedict, requiring that every monk should work, and the impulse toward learning which Cassiodorus gave the order, prevented the monks of the west from becoming ignorant and useless, as were monks of the east. They were not permitted to withdraw from the world entirely, but were made useful members of society. The monks were excellent tools in the hands of the popes, for whose purpose of conquering the world no better man could be found than one who despised the world and had turned his back upon it. The papacy also drew them away from their original ideal and gave them a still greater field of activity.

The monks were not necessarily clergymen. At first they were all laymen, but later it came to be the custom for them to receive ordination. The monastic life was regarded as the ideal Christian life. So prevalent was this idea that wherever possible the clergy of a diocese were gathered together, and compelled to live in a common house according to a common rule. From this fact all such came to be called the "regular clergy," while those of the outlying districts and villages who did not live in this way were called the "secular clergy."

In the tenth century monasticism was in a wretched state of decline. The rule of St Benedict was so little regarded and the life in the monasteries had so degenerated, that it seemed

as if monasticism must die out. Its first great reform began in the monastery of Cluny, which was founded (910) in the hills a few miles west of Mâcon. *Cluny.* Under the headship of a series of most capable and earnest abbots, Cluny achieved a wide reputation for piety. With its growing fame the number of its monks increased until it was possible to send out colonies of monks to establish new monasteries. As the spirit of reform awoke elsewhere, monks from Cluny were asked to visit other monasteries and introduce the new rule, discipline, and ideas. In this way the Cluniac rule became common in Europe during the tenth and eleventh centuries. All the monasteries which used it were bound together by it, and were called a "congregation." The abbot of Cluny was at the head of this congregation, and, therefore, possessed immense power. The objects which this *The Cluniac* reform had in view were those which were taken up *programme.* by Gregory VII. and by him made the programme of the papacy. The monastic rule must be made more rigorous and be more vigorously enforced. The secular clergy must be made to live after this monkish rule, and the spiritual aristocracy thus formed by the monks and clergy should have complete authority over the laity in all religious matters. Gregory VII., indeed, went a step farther: to the spiritual authority over the whole world he added also the political authority<sup>1</sup>

In the eleventh century, however, there was so great a deepening of the monastic spirit that even the rule of Cluny seemed to some to be too lax. This led to the *Formation* formation of several orders, such as the Carthusians *of orders* (1084), the Cistercians (1098), the Premonstrants (1120), the Carmelites (1156), and others which, for the most part, achieved only a local reputation. The tendency to form separate orders, and the number of those who applied to the pope for permission to establish new ones increased; and though Innocent III finally refused to listen to any more appeals, and forbade the establishment of any more orders, the prohibition was immediately disregarded.

<sup>1</sup> See page 125.

St Francis of Assisi, the founder of the order which bears his name (Franciscans, *fratres minores*, friars, Minor-  
*St Francis.* ites), was filled with the idea of the imitation of Christ and his apostles in their preaching, poverty, and service to others. "The Franciscan brother" should spend his life on the highway, stopping to preach and minister unto others whenever occasion offered; he should work for his bread, if work could be found; if not, he might beg; he should never receive money under any circumstances, nor more food than was sufficient for his wants for the day; he must never lay up any store in this world; he must care for the sick, visit those who were in prison, cheer the downcast, recover the lost, and be to the world a Christ. The life of Jesus was to be his model in all things. During the period from 1209 to 1226 the order of  
*The rule of* St Francis was thoroughly established and his rule  
*poverty* developed and confirmed by the pope. The order,  
*evaded* however, soon underwent a change which deeply offended St Francis—it began to amass property and build houses

St Dominic, a Spaniard (1170-1221), established the order of Preaching Brothers (*Fratres Prædicatorum*, 1215) to resist the spread of heresy in the Church. They were to be  
*St Dominic.* trained in all the learning of the day and made equal to the task of instructing the people in the doctrines of the Church. In 1220 St Dominic introduced the rule of poverty into the order, thus modelling it after the order of St Francis. The two orders had much the same development, becoming large, rich, and powerful. St Francis had not intended that his brothers should devote themselves to learning, but they took it up in imitation of the Dominicans, and the two orders furnished all the great scholars of the later Middle Ages.

The dark side of monasticism has been often painted. There were many periods of decadence in its history. The  
*Faults of* piety of the monks brought them popularity and  
*monasticism.* wealth; wealth brought them to leisure, idleness, and profligacy. The principles of monasticism were opposed

to the dignity of the family, and to the proper position of woman in society. The best human talent was frequently drawn into the monastery and, hence, lost to the state

Much more, indeed, might be said against the institution, but the good which it did far outweighs the evil. Monasticism furnished the missionaries who Christianized and civilized western and northern Europe. Every monastery became a centre of life and learning, and hence a light to the surrounding country. The monks cleared the lands and brought them under cultivation. They were the farmers, and taught by example the dignity of labour in an age when the soldier was the world's hero. They preserved and transmitted much of the civilization of Rome to the barbarians. They were the teachers of the west. Literature and learning found a refuge with them in times of violence. Their monasteries were the hotels of the Middle Age, and they cared for the poor and the sick. They were the greatest builders of their time, many of the great churches of Europe being their work. Monasticism was therefore an excellent thing for the world in those days. But the times changed. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it no longer had a great mission. Other forces and institutions were then at hand to carry on the work which it had begun. The proof of this is that in the fifteenth century it was dying out. The monasteries were no longer full, and it was impossible to keep their numbers complete. The old monasticism was powerless; it was no longer adapted to the character and needs of society.

The Middle Ages had two distinct ideals, the soldier and the monk. Contradictory as they may seem, it is not strange that they fused and produced military-monkish orders, which arose under the peculiar circumstances which prevailed in Palestine during the crusades. The Knights of St John were organized (1099) for the care of the sick among the pilgrims and crusaders. It was not long, however, until the military element was added, because being surrounded and constantly threatened by Saracens they had to defend them-

*The benefits  
of monasti-  
cism.*

*Military-  
monkish  
Orders.*

*The  
Knights of  
St John.*

selves. In 1119 the Knights Templars were established in imitation of the Knights of St John. Both orders *Knights Templars* were composed of men who took all the vows of monks, but spent their time fighting. Because of their connection with the Holy Land, the two orders became very popular throughout the west, and received immense gifts.

In 1190, during the siege of Ptolemais, a hospital was established for Germans, the members of which were soon afterwards organized into a military-monkish order *The German Order on the Baltic* in imitation of the two spoken of above. They were called German Knights. They tried hard to get a foothold in the east, but the other orders were so much older and had been so much longer in the field that it was impossible. In 1226 they were invited to come to Prussia (the territory east of the lower Vistula) to fight against the heathen Prussians. In 1202 Albert, bishop of Riga, had established a similar order, known as the Sword Brothers, and had made use of them in conquering and Christianizing the heathen of Livonia and Esthonia. In 1237 these two orders were united, and to this union it was due that so large a territory east of the Vistula was Germanized and Christianized, and added finally to Germany.

## CHAPTER XII

### MOHAMMED, MOHAMMEDANISM, AND THE CRUSADES

#### LITERATURE.—See General Literature

- Cox, *The Crusades*  
Sybel, *History and Literature of the Crusades*  
Muir, *Life of Mahomet and the Caliphate*  
Yule, *Marco Polo*  
Mombert, *Short History of the Crusades*  
Archer and Kingsford, *The Crusades*  
Gray, *The Children's Crusade*  
Thatcher and Schwill, *Europe in the Middle Age*  
Gulman, *Saracens*  
Pears, *Fall of Constantinople*  
Archer, *Crusade of Richard I.*  
Conder, *Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*  
Carlyle, *Hercles and Hero Worship*  
Oman, *The Art of War in the Middle Ages*  
*Chronicles of the Crusades*  
Penn Univ. Translations    Vols. I. and III contain material relating to the crusades

BEFORE the time of Mohammed the Arabs had no central government. They were separated into independent tribes. In the tribe there was a kind of patriarchal government, but no recognized officials intrusted with the enforcement of the laws and the execution of justice. Even in the towns there was no real government. Every one maintained the right of private vengeance. Each family, defending itself and its interests, was bound to avenge any injury done to its members; consequently there were constant feuds among them. Until united by Mohammed, the Arabs can hardly be said to have had a political existence.

The religion of the Arabs was a crass idolatry. They worshipped the heavenly bodies, as well as a large number of spirits known as genii, ogres, and demons, all of which play a

prominent part in their literature. They observed a holy month, in which all warfare was suspended and no one dared do even his worst enemy an injury. Markets were held during this season at the holy places, and under this double security commerce flourished. About the middle of the fifth century

*Mecca.* of our era the city of Mecca was founded at a place where from time immemorial there had been a temple, known as the Kaaba. The tribe known as the Koreischites had got possession of the temple, and by collecting there all the religious rites of Arabia, made of Mecca its religious and commercial capital. Christianity, although of a poor type, was known in Arabia; Judaism also was represented there by many Jewish colonies, especially along the western coast.

Of Mohammed's early life very little is known. He was born in Mecca about 570. The death of his father, mother, *Mohammed*, and grandfather left him to the care of his uncle. 570-632. His family was poor, however, and Mohammed was compelled to perform the most menial labour. When about twenty-five years old he entered the service of a rich widow, whom he served so faithfully as to win her hand and heart. His marriage with her raised him from his humble position of poverty to one of influence. When about forty years old Mohammed began to preach against polytheism and idolatry. The burden of all his messages to his people was that there was one God, who required of his followers certain religious and humane duties, and who would in the next world reward or punish all men in accordance with their conduct in this. The Meccans generally did not take him seriously at first, but in the course of a few years he had gathered about him a goodly number of people who believed *His first converts.* in him and his divine calling. His wife and children, his slaves, a few of his relatives, and several poor and humble people, especially slaves, accepted him as a prophet and attached themselves to him. During the first five years of his preaching he had also won over the four men who were to succeed him as khalifs, Abu Bekr,

Omar, Othman, and Ali. As his following grew in numbers the Meccans began to oppose him bitterly, because he was attacking their idols, and might thereby injure the reputation of the city, and also because he was establishing a society on a new basis. The union between him and his followers was not based on blood relationship, but on a common religious belief, which seemed to the Meccans dangerous and revolutionary. Their opposition soon developed into persecution.

Mohammed then sent some of his followers into Abyssinia, where he hoped they would be free from all oppression. As the hostility of the Meccans toward him became greater, however, he saw that he also must eventually leave the city. He accordingly tried to make an alliance with some tribe to whom he might retire when he withdrew from Mecca. After meeting with several refusals, he fell in with some men from Jathrib, or, as it came to be called later, Medina, who were inclined to believe in his prophetic character. The Arabs of Medina lived among Jews, from whom they had learned of many of the ideas which Mohammed was proclaiming. After Mohammed had laboured two years with them, the people of Medina made an alliance with him, accepting his religion and agreeing to protect him. Mohammed then sent as many of his followers to Medina as could free themselves from their entanglements in Mecca, and he himself, with Abu Bekr, soon followed. This flight of Mohammed, called the Hegira, took place in the year 622, and became the basis for the Mohammedan system of reckoning time.

During the first year after the flight Mohammed tried hard to win the Jews of Medina and the surrounding country, believing that since they were monotheists there could be but little difference between them and himself. Under Jewish influence he developed certain religious ceremonies, such as fasting and prayer. All the references in the Koran to the Jews during this period are friendly; but before the first year was passed, Mohammed discovered that the Jews could not

*Alliance  
with  
Medina.*

*The Hegira,  
622.*



be persuaded to accept him. This led him to turn from them and exert himself in the conversion of the Arabs. Up to this time Jerusalem had been regarded by him as the Holy City, toward which during prayer he and his followers had turned their faces. Now he determined to win the Arabs. His first step was to make Mecca, which, although the great national centre of the Arabs, had played an unimportant rôle in his belief, the Holy City of his religion. Mecca and the Kaaba replaced Jerusalem and the temple. To justify this change Mohammed made use of the tradition of Abraham and Ishmael, connecting them with the building of the Kaaba and making Abraham the father of the Arabs. Abraham had been made to do duty by both Jews and Christians, both having laid claim to him, Mohammed now declared that Abraham had been neither Jew nor Christian, but Mohammedan.

But Mecca was not in the hands of Mohammed, and the Meccans were hostile to him. For the purpose of revenge, as well as of getting possession of the Kaaba, Mohammed began to instil into the minds of his followers the idea that war against those who had done violence to the faithful was justifiable. In a short time, in order to precipitate a war, he sent out some of his men to attack and rob a caravan of the Meccans. Inflamed by the hope of booty, the people of Medina now joined him in an attempt to capture another caravan on its way to Mecca; but its leader outwitted them. A thousand men had come out from Mecca to defend the caravan and to avenge themselves for the previous loss which they had sustained. Mohammed, with only three hundred men, met the thousand Meccans at Badr, and after killing about seventy of them, put the rest to flight. Much booty was taken, which Mohammed judiciously distributed among those who had fought for him. This military success of Mohammed quite turned him from the propagation of his faith in a peaceable way to the use of the sword. It soon became his settled

*Mohammed turns from the Jews to the Arabs.*

*The desire of revenge leads Mohammed to resort to arms.*

*The change wrought in him by military success.*

policy to compel the Arabian to accept him and his religion. During the rest of his life he suffered but few reverses; before his death all Arabia acknowledged him, and his followers were prepared to carry his faith by force into all lands.

Mohammed's life may be divided into two periods. During the first one he was a preacher of righteousness—a reformer. Those parts of the Koran delivered during this period are religious and poetical. He felt religious truth so directly that he believed that God was speaking to him. It is difficult to believe that during this period Mohammed was an impostor, or that he consciously used fraud. But after the flight he was moved by considerations that were not wholly religious. It was his desire for revenge that led him to attack Mecca. He felt that he was establishing a new religion and a new state. As his interests became political, he lost sight of the purer objects of his religion, resorting to means which seem to us very questionable, though he probably thought that the purpose he had in view justified him in all he did. During the last years of his life he was lacking in inspiration. His style became dull and prolix, for the later chapters of the Koran are by no means equal to the earlier ones.

*Mohammed  
not an  
impostor.  
At first a  
reformer, he  
becomes a  
politician.*

While Mohammed had many of the faults of his age, he was in many respects also far ahead of it. He practised and permitted polygamy, and may seem to have degraded woman. But when it is remembered that polygamy was practised among his people long before his time, and that in other ways he did much to raise woman to a higher plane, we must judge him leniently. A proper estimate of his character can be formed only after a careful study of his times and a knowledge of him in all the relations of his life. Many of his most serious faults were due either to his conception of the prophetic office, or to the character of his times or people. His character was full of contrast. He has been compared in this respect with King David, in whom vindictiveness, cruelty, and deceit were joined with the

*His char-  
acter.*

most noble qualities. Mohammed was simple and modest and free from luxury in food, dress, and surroundings. Even in the days of his greatest success he lived in the plainest fashion, mending his own clothes, and attending to his own wants. He needed no slaves, and consequently liberated most of the captives who fell to him in the distribution of spoil. Mild, gentle, forgiving, and conciliatory, he was never a tyrant to his people. He associated freely with men of every rank. He was true in all his friendships and deeply grateful for any kindness shown him. In common with his age, he was superstitious and believed in the influence of good and evil spirits, and in the importance of dreams and all kinds of omens.

Mohammed made the Arabs into a nation and brought them into history. His influence on them intellectually

*His quickening influence on the Arabs*

may be seen from the fact that for nearly three hundred years the Arabs led the world in civilization. The good parts of his work were later

destroyed by the ignorant and fanatical peoples from central Asia, who came down and acquired the political power over the Mohammedan world. Under their influence

*Modern Mohammedanism is Turkish.*

all the evils of Mohammed's religion were developed and its good destroyed. Mohammed himself is not responsible for the Mohammedanism of to-day, it is the creation of the Turkish

peoples who adopted his religion and have ruled it for nearly eight hundred years. Turkish Mohammedanism is a very different thing from the early Arabic Mohammedanism.

Mohammed was a religious genius. It may be objected that he produced nothing new and that he was indebted to the Jews and Christians for nearly all his ideas. While that is true, he nevertheless felt, as no one else had for several centuries, the power of these ideas. He saw and felt a great religious truth in a direct way. His originality consisted not so much in new knowledge as in the vigour, directness, and certainty of his religious perceptions. Others might have learned the same things from the Jews and

Christians, but Mohammed alone felt their truth and breathed into them a new religious power.

Mohammed died in 632, and in turn four of his earliest converts, Abu Bekr (632-34), Omar (634-44), Othman (644-55), and Ali (655-61), were elected khalif. Before the death of Ali, Syria, Persia, the Euphrates valley, and all the territory as far as the Oxus river and the confines of India and Egypt, with a part of north Africa, were conquered and converted to the faith of Mohammed. But dissensions arose, and Othman and Ali were both murdered. A relative of Othman made himself khalif and established himself in Damascus (661)

*Divisions  
in the Mo-  
hammedan  
world*

instead of Medina. He and his family, known as the Ommeiades, ruled in Damascus till, in 750, the Abbassides, the descendants of an uncle of Mohammed, usurped the khalifate and removed its seat to Bagdad. This change of capital was a mistake, because from that city it was impossible to rule the whole Mohammedan world. Egypt

*The Turks  
become the  
ruling  
power.*

and Spain revolted and set up rival khalifs. In the eleventh century the Seldjuk Turks came down from central Asia and made themselves master of all the Mohammedan parts of Asia. In 1058 their leader, Togrul Beg, went to Bagdad, received all the temporal authority of the khalif, and became sultan of the Mohammedan world. The khalif became merely a religious officer; the political authority rested in the hands of Togrul Beg and his successors. The changed khalifate continued till 1258, when the son of the great conqueror, Ghengis Khan, put to death the last khalif at Bagdad.

In 750, when the Ommeiad dynasty was destroyed, one member of the family escaped and made his way to Spain, where, received with honour, he was recognized as the lord of the country. With the name of emir or sultan, he and his descendants ruled in Spain till 929, when they assumed the title of khalif. Under this family the Mohammedan power in Spain was well united and enjoyed a season of great prosperity. In 1031, however,

*The khalif-  
fate of  
Spain.*

a revolution put an end to the khalifate, breaking it into a large number of small principalities, and the Christians, pressing in on all sides, reconquered some of their territory.

After the fall of the Ommeiades Africa suffered a long period of violence and discord, but in the tenth century a

*Africa.* pretended descendant of Fatuna, a daughter of Mohammed, got possession of it. His descendants founded Cairo (969) and made it the seat of their government

*The khalifate of Cairo.* They controlled nearly all the islands of the western Mediterranean and held several posts in Italy and France. By constant wars, however,

their power was broken, and in 1171 Saladin, the ruler of western Asia, conquered Egypt and made an end of the khalifate of Cairo.

During the five centuries following Mohammed's death there was produced among his followers a civilization far

*The Arabic civilization.* in advance of anything in Europe. The basis for it all they received from Persia and Greece, but they added much to the stock thus obtained. In the administration of the government the Mohammedans had an excellent system, which was pretty thoroughly unified. Their system of taxation was good. They restored the old Roman roads and built new ones, thus binding all parts of the empire together, and they constructed canals and aqueducts. A postal system was in operation among them. They developed a style of architecture, which was characterized by the round and horse-shoe arch, the dome, the tall and graceful minaret, and the richness of its interior ornamentation. In everything connected with their buildings they showed the most exquisite taste and appreciation of beauty, and their architectural remains are still the wonder and envy of the world.

They established universities, which excelled all those of Europe for several centuries. The mosques were generally

*Learning.* the seats of universities or learned societies, and were the places where all sorts of questions were

freely discussed. Among the famous universities were those of Bagdad, Cairo, and Cordova. The university of Cairo,

which still exists in the mosque El Azhar, had as many, as twelve thousand students. Libraries were formed, some of which are said to have contained several hundred thousand volumes. The universities, especially in Spain, were visited by Christian students, who thus acquired the Mohammedan learning and culture and carried them into Christian Europe. Philosophy, theology, law, rhetoric, and philology were studied with great zest. Dictionaries were compiled, and commentaries on the Koran written. The Mohammedans knew the works of Aristotle, and based their philosophical systems upon his principles of philosophy. Several works by them on travel and history and some biographies are handed down to us.

In mathematics they built on the foundations of the Greek mathematicians. The origin of the so-called Arabic numerals is obscure. Under Theodoric the Great, *Mathe-* Boethius made use of certain signs which were in *matics*. part very like the nine digits which we now use. One of the pupils of Gerbert also used signs which were still more like ours, but the zero was unknown till in the twelfth century, when it was invented by the Arab mathematician named Mohammed-Ibn Mousa, who also was the first to use the decimal notation, and who gave the digits the value of position. In geometry the Arabs did not add much to Euclid, but algebra is practically their creation; also they developed spherical trigonometry, inventing the sine, tangent, and cotangent. In physics they invented the pendulum, and produced work on optics. They made progress in the science of astronomy. They built several observatories and constructed many astronomical instruments which are still in use. They calculated the angle of the ecliptic and the precession of the equinoxes. Their knowledge of astronomy was undoubtedly profound.

In medicine they made great advances over the work of the Greeks. They studied physiology and hygiene, *Medicine* and their "*materia medica*" was practically the *and Chem-* same as ours to-day. Many of their methods of *istry* treatment are still in use among us. Their surgeons understood

the use of anæsthetics and performed some of the most difficult operations known. At the time when in Europe the practice of medicine was forbidden by the Church, which expected cures to be effected by religious rites performed by the clergy, the Arabs had a real science of medicine. In chemistry they made a good beginning. They discovered many new substances and compounds, such as alcohol, potassium, nitrate of silver, corrosive sublimate, and nitric and sulphuric acid.

In literature, also, the Arabs laboured, producing many works of imagination. They had a special fondness for poetry.

*Literature,*  
*Manu-*  
*factures,*  
*Farming.* In manufactures they outdid the world in variety and beauty of design and perfection of workmanship. They worked in all the metals—gold, silver, copper, bronze, iron, and steel. In textile fabrics they have never been surpassed. They made glass and pottery of the finest quality. They knew the secrets of dyeing and they manufactured paper. They had many processes of dressing leather, and their work was famous throughout Europe. They made tinctures, essences, and syrups. They made sugar from the cane and grew many fine kinds of wine. They practised farming in a scientific way and had good systems of irrigation. They knew the value of fertilizers, and adapted their crops to the quality of the ground. They excelled in horticulture, knowing how to graft, and how to produce new varieties of fruits and flowers. They introduced into the west many trees and plants from the east, and wrote scientific treatises on farming.

Their commerce attained great proportions. Their caravans traversed the empire from one end to the other, and their sails covered the seas. They held at many places great fairs and markets, some of which were visited by merchants from all parts of Europe and Asia. Their merchants had connections with China, India, and the East Indies, with the interior of Africa and with Russia, and with all the countries lying around the Baltic.

Much of the Mohammedan civilization was destined to

be introduced into Europe, especially by means of the crusades. In its own home, however, it suffered almost complete annihilation by the coming of the ignorant and fanatical Turks, who showed, indeed, that they could prey upon it, but could not assimilate and improve it, whose fanaticism led them to oppose all science, because it might be injurious to their religious belief, and whose hatred of people of other religions led them into wars, during which industry and commerce languished. Since the Turks were barbarian and without any appreciation of the necessities as well as the luxuries of civilized life, they tended to destroy the culture which they found. Since their coming Mohammedanism has changed utterly, and the lands which were once gardens are now almost like a desert.

*Arabic civilization destroyed by the Turks.*

(The descendants of Togrul Beg continued their conquests to the west till they took Asia Minor from the emperor and even threatened Constantinople. In his extremity the emperor is said to have sent messengers to the pope to ask aid. In 1095 Urban II. went into France, and at a council at Clermont called on all

*Urban II. preaches the first crusade*

the west to take up arms and recover the holy places. He met with an unexpected response. After he had ceased speaking, thousands pressed around him, took the vow to go on the crusade, and received the sign, a red cross fastened to the right shoulder diagonally across the breast. Urban renewed the prohibition of private war, put the property of all crusaders under the special protection of the Church, offered large rewards to all who would join the movement, and commanded the clergy to preach the crusade in all parts of France.

Among the many who went out to preach the crusade was Peter the Hermit. The ordinary accounts which make Peter the originator of the crusade are entirely false. He had never been in Palestine; had never seen the pope; and had nothing to do with Urban till after the crusade had been announced at Clermont. By his preaching he got together a few thousand men and women—a disorderly mob without arms—and set out for Palestine. He led

*Peter the Hermit.*



them to Constantinople and thence a short distance into Asia Minor, where they were cut to pieces by the Turks. Peter himself escaped to Constantinople, and waited for the main army to come up.

There was no leader of the crusade and no central authority. From the north of France came Hugo of Vermandois, a brother of king Philip I., Stephen of Blois, Robert of Normandy, Godfrey of Bouillon and his two brothers, Eustace and Baldwin, and their nephew, Baldwin the Younger, from

*The leaders  
inefficient,  
the army not  
consolidated.*

southern France, Raymond, count of Toulouse, and from Italy, Boemund and his nephew, Tancred. Of all these only one, Boemund, had any ability as a leader; and unfortunately for the undertaking, it was impossible for him to obtain the leadership. Each one led his own men, and was practically independent of all the others. It is said that the army which was thus brought together numbered nearly a million, but we have no means of forming an accurate estimate of its size.

The crusading army was motley in its make-up. (Many had, of course, joined the movement out of religious motives, hoping to have a part in the meritorious work of reconquering the holy places.) The pope had promised remission of sins to all who should lose their lives while on the crusade, and many supernatural advantages seemed likely to be derived from such an undertaking. Others were there who had run away from their debts or from their families; there were even criminals, who hoped thus to escape punishment. Many serfs ran away from their lords, and from the hard conditions under which they lived. Many came because of the opportunity to gratify their love of adventure and travel. The leaders, almost without exception, had joined in the movement principally because they wished to acquire power and establish an independent principality somewhere in the east, on lands to be taken from the Saracens or from the Greeks. The pope had the desire to deliver the holy places, but at the same time he wished to extend his ecclesiastical authority over the east. The cities of Italy, some

of which joined to a certain extent in the first crusade, were led principally by the desire to extend their commerce and to secure harbour privileges in the east.

Remembering his recent experiences with Robert Guiscard, Alexius, the emperor at Constantinople, feared the crusaders. He divined the purpose of the leaders and felt that he was not secure from their attacks. It was quite natural that he should endeavour to protect his interests. As the leaders arrived at Constantinople he either persuaded or forced them to take an oath that they would deliver to him all the territory which they should conquer, promising them that, if they wished, they might receive it back as a fief. Boemund was the only one of the crusaders frank enough to tell the emperor what his intentions were. He offered his services to Alexius, plainly informing him that he wished to make his fortune in the east; but the emperor, distrusting him, refused to give him a position of trust and authority.

In 1097 the army, after crossing the Bosphorus, set out for Nicæa. After besieging the town for several days, they were about to take it when Alexius secured its surrender to himself. The crusaders, not allowed to sack the place, were angry with Alexius, and accused him of acting in bad faith with them. Their charges were, however, without foundation.

The march through Asia Minor was a difficult one; many perished by the way of hunger and thirst. Toward the end of October, 1097, the army reached Antioch, and began its siege. The city held out for several months, until when a great army under Kerbogha, emir of Mosul, was approaching for its relief, Boemund told the other leaders that, if they would agree to give him Antioch for his possession, he would deliver it into their hands. They finally consented, and the following night Boemund, by the aid of a traitor, secured an entrance into the city. At daybreak the gates were opened, the crusaders rushed in, and the work of destruction and pillage began. The Mohammedans were

killed without pity and their houses looted. Only the citadel held out, but to this, in the wild scramble for spoil, the crusaders paid no attention. Three days later Kerbogha arrived, and now the crusaders became the besieged. For a few days Kerbogha pushed the siege with great vigour. The Christians lost courage, for it seemed the city could not hold out against Kerbogha. But a pious fraud was now planned, which filled the crusaders with enthusiasm and enabled them to overcome the besieging army. It was said that in a vision the whereabouts of the holy lance had been revealed to one of the crusaders, and when they dug in the place designated, of course they found the lance. Some of the crusaders knew that this was a fraud, but others believed in it. When the army marched out with this lance at its head, the army of Kerbogha was put to utter rout, leaving its camp in the hands of the Christians.

In the meantime Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey, had gone to Edessa and had, by very questionable means, made himself master of the city. Edessa became a most important outpost for the Christians.

After the destruction of Kerbogha's army the way was open to Jerusalem. Boemund wished to remain in Antioch until he had got the city under his control. Raymond of Toulouse, envious of the good fortune of Boemund, coveted the city and refused to proceed to Jerusalem.

He tried in vain in every way to gain a foothold in the neighbourhood of Antioch and to dispossess Boemund. At length the crusaders, angry at the delay, declared they would burn Antioch unless Raymond gave up the struggle and led them on to Jerusalem. Raymond yielded very unwillingly, and more than once stopped by the way and laid siege to some town. At last, worn out with waiting, the crusaders set fire to their tents and began a mad sort of race toward Jerusalem. Reaching the city, they besieged it for several weeks, and finally stormed and took it, July 15, 1099.

Hardly was the city taken when a quarrel arose as to what

should be done with it. The clergy wished to make it an ecclesiastical state under the rule of a patriarch. The princes however, would not listen to this, but could with difficulty find any one who wished to assume control of it. In the end a compromise was effected by which Godfrey of Bouillon was put over it with the title of "Protector of the Holy Grave." A few days later the crusaders left Jerusalem and began their journey home, and the first crusade was at an end. It had cost Europe

*Godfrey of Bouillon made Protector of the Holy Grave, 1099.*

an immense number of men, and had accomplished very little. Boemund had possession of Antioch, Baldwin of Edessa, and Godfrey of Jerusalem. Alexius had also regained nearly all of Asia Minor. In the eyes of the west however, the reconquest of the Holy Grave was by far the most important result of the crusade, and well worth all that it had cost. The returning crusaders were received with every mark of honour, and their stories so filled the people with enthusiasm that a new crusade was immediately organized. From 1100 to 1102 several hundred thousand men went to the east, only to be cut to pieces in Asia Minor.

*Results of the crusade.*

*Crusade of 1100-2.*

The Christian states which had been founded in the east had a chequered history, many chapters of which were far from ideal. Lack of good political judgment, jealousy, intrigue, and treachery prevented their best development. They quarrelled with the emperor and with each other, and it often happened that Christians made alliances with Mohammedans against other Christians.

*Strife among the Christian states in Syria.*

The new emir of Mosul, Zangi, ambitious to rule over the Mohammedan world, began a policy of conquest. In 1144 he took Edessa and threatened both Antioch and Jerusalem, till, in their extremity, the Christians appealed to the west for help. The fall of Edessa caused great consternation in Europe, without, however, producing any immediate action.

*Zangi takes Edessa, 1144.*

Europe had undergone a great change since Urban II. had

first issued the call for a crusade. Contested papal elections and the rule of some inefficient popes had somewhat reduced the power and prestige of the papacy. *Europe changed* Europe had, in the meantime, been growing rich from her rapidly increasing commerce, and wealth was producing a great change in the people. Political interests were occupying a larger place in the minds of all. Louis VI. was strengthening the royal power in France. Roger had made a kingdom out of Sicily and Southern Italy. The cities of Lombardy were increasing in wealth, power, and independence. A great change, illustrated by the life of Abelard, had taken place in the thought of Europe. Here and there people had begun to think independently of the Church and her creed. Reason was awakening. The study of Roman law had been revived. Poets were beginning to sing songs of love and wine. Europe, slowly recovering from her attack of asceticism, was thinking less of the future world and more of the enjoyment of this. Arnold of Brescia was in Rome, preaching against the wealth of the clergy and their exercise of political authority. The high demands of Gregory VII. had been relaxed a little. Pope Eugene III. was himself unimportant, and the leadership was in the hands of Bernard of Clairvaux, who did not wish that the pope should have secular power. He thought that their spiritual authority should be enforced only by spiritual means.

A second crusade under these circumstances was difficult. But, by his eloquence, Bernard of Clairvaux overcame all difficulties. Louis VII. of France was desirous of going, and Conrad III. of Germany yielded to Bernard's fiery speech and took the vow. The Germans did the Greeks much damage while passing through the empire and the eastern emperor actually had to make war on the crusaders before their excesses could be checked. The French army was more discreet, but, to make the situation more critical, king Robert II. of Sicily was making war on the empire. The emperor, although in great danger from the crusaders, was adroit enough to keep the peace with them, and get them across the Bosphorus. Both armies,

however, went to pieces in Asia Minor. Hunger, thirst, the fatigue of the journey, and the weapons of the Mohammedans left only a few thousand men who reached Palestine. There they made the mistake of besieging Damascus, whose emir was friendly to the Christians, instead of using all their efforts to break the power of Zangi, the real enemy. The second crusade ended in making the condition of the Christians in Syria worse instead of better; and Europe was so disgusted with the failure of the great preparations, that for many years no further efforts were made to send re-enforcements to the east.

*Failure of  
the second  
crusade,  
1147-49.*

Fortunately for the Syrian Christians, Zangi died and his power went to pieces. But the Christians in Palestine learned no wisdom from their experiences. Intrigue and treachery increased among them. They became weaker and more contemptible, till, in 1187, Saladin, who had made himself master of western Asia and Egypt, was forced to make war on them. He had borne with them for a long time, but finally, enraged at their faithlessness, he attacked them, and in a few weeks had taken all their strongholds. His capture of Jerusalem stirred the west profoundly, and led the great rulers, the emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, Philip II. of France, and Richard I. of England to organize a crusade for its recovery. After the most careful and statesmanlike preparations, Frederick led a well disciplined army of one hundred thousand men through Asia Minor, only to meet his death by drowning while crossing a swollen mountain stream, and the army, left without a leader, melted away. Only a few of them reached Syria.

*Saladin con-  
quers Syria,  
1187.*

*Frederick  
Barbarossa.*

*His death,  
June 10,  
1190*

The armies of Philip and Richard went by sea and safely reached their destination, but their effectiveness was diminished by the quarrel which broke out between the two kings. On the way Richard conquered Cyprus and made of it a Christian kingdom, which was to be a strong defence for many years against the Mohammedans. Before the armies had reached Syria the Christians there had

*Philip II  
and Richard  
I*

made the mistake of attacking Acre, a strong fortress on the coast. Their efforts should have been to drive *The siege of Acre* Saladin into the interior. They did not specially need Acre, since they already had several good ports, and in taking it the third crusade wore itself out. After its capture Philip returned home, and Richard, too, after engaging in many chivalrous adventures without accomplishing anything for the good of the cause, sailed away. He was shipwrecked in the Adriatic, taken prisoner, and set free only on the payment of a heavy ransom. The third crusade was also a failure, for the conquest of Acre was no adequate return for the expenditure of means, effort, and life which had been made.

The crusade of Henry VI. was only a part of his larger plan of conquest, by which he meant to make himself master of the Greek empire and of the east. In 1196 he sent *Henry VI.* an army of sixty thousand men into Syria, but his unexpected death left his men without a master, and the army's dissolution rapidly followed.

The west was exhausted and discouraged. Her great armies had melted away in the east without accomplishing anything.

*The fourth crusade directed against Constantinople, 1202-4.* Hundreds of thousands of men were still ready to take the crusader's vow, but few were willing to fulfil it. All the efforts of Innocent III. could bring together only a few thousand knights, who, hoping to secure the service of the Venetian fleet in their undertaking, went to Venice. Being unable to pay the whole sum demanded for transportation, they agreed to work for their passage by assisting the Venetians in reducing Zara, a pirate city on the coast of Dalmatia, which had been preying on the commerce of the Venetians. In October, 1202, Zara was reduced, and the crusaders demanded the fulfilment of agreement. They wished to be carried to Egypt, because it seemed to them that it would be better to attack the Mohammedan power in its most important seat. But Venice, at peace with the Mohammedans of Egypt, enjoyed a rich commerce with them. The doge of Venice, therefore, shrewdly turned the crusaders aside from their purpose and led them against

Constantinople. His purpose in this was to avenge himself for a private grudge against that city, and also to secure more harbour and commercial privileges in the east. Constantinople was at this time the leading commercial city of the Mediterranean, Venice envied her ~~the~~ supremacy, and hoped, with the help of the crusaders, to humble her. The crusaders themselves had little interest in the war with the Mohammedans. They were, for the most part, soldiers of fortune, adventurers ready for any undertaking that promised them a rich reward. An exiled emperor offered them a large sum of money if they would restore him to his throne, and Venice added her inducements. In spite of the opposition of the pope, the crusaders therefore moved against Constantinople and took it. They soon quarrelled with the emperor whom they had restored because he could not pay what he had promised. The quarrel led to the sacking of the city, the expulsion of the emperor, and the establishment of a western man as ruler in Constantinople. This Latin kingdom, as it was called, existed till 1261, when the Greeks put an end to it and restored an emperor of their own. The Venetians received as their share of the spoils, in 1204, many of the Greek islands, some parts of the mainland of Greece, and a large quarter, and harbour and commercial privileges in Constantinople. From this time they controlled to a great extent the eastern Mediterranean, and were the foremost commercial power of Europe.

*The Latin  
kingdom in  
the east,  
1204-61*

The crusades which followed this expedition against Constantinople were all unimportant in their results. The most curious of them all was the Children's Crusade. In the summer of 1212 forty thousand children were brought together in Germany and crossed the Alps into Italy. The number gradually melted away by deaths, desertions, or seizures, and only a handful of them reached Brindisi, from which a few of them are said to have sailed, never to be heard of again. The fate of the French children was even worse. Thirty thousand of them joined in the march

*The Chil-  
dren's Cru-  
sade.*



toward Marseilles, from which port probably five thousand of them sailed away, only to be betrayed and sold as slaves in the Mohammedan markets.

In 1217 another crusade was attempted, which resulted in the capture of Damietta. The Christians, however, were not able to improve their opportunities, the city was soon taken from them, and their army destroyed. *The last crusades unimportant.* Frederick II. led a crusade (1228-29), but won all his victories by diplomacy and not by the sword. In 1239-40 another crusade was made, but without results. In 1244 Mohammedan Asia was overrun by a wild horde of Turks who had been called in by one of the political factions of the Mohammedans themselves, and who devastated the country west of the Euphrates and captured Jerusalem and all the Christian cities in southern Syria; and from this time Jerusalem, lost to the Christians, was destined to remain under Mohammedan control. Louis IX. of France undertook to recover the Holy City, but after some successes in Egypt his army was destroyed and he returned to Europe without having accomplished anything. He made another crusade in 1270, the objective point of which was Tunis, but during the siege of that city he died.

The end of the Christian power in Syria was fast approaching. The military-monkish orders fought with each other, and

the Venetians and other Italian states were engaged in constant feuds. The Mohammedans were carrying on the work of conquest with skill. *Syria reconquered by the Mohammedans.*

In 1265 Cæsarea and Arsuf were taken and destroyed. The great fortress Safed fell the next year. In 1268 Joppa shared the same fate, and the whole of northern Syria was lost by the surrender of Antioch in May of the same year. Thereupon Gregory X. had a crusade preached throughout all Europe, but without success. More than once divisions among the Mohammedans gave the remaining Christians in Syria a little respite, but their fate could not be avoided. Tripolis was taken in 1289, and in 1291 Acre was besieged, and after a few months of brave resistance captured.

The Christians were thus driven out of Syria, and the whole country was in the hands of the Mohammedans. The Knights of St John established themselves on some of the islands, especially Rhodes, which they held for nearly two hundred years. Cyprus remained a Latin kingdom until 1489, when it was seized by Venice and made a part of her territory.

Although there were no more crusades, the idea of them did not die. Several popes during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries called on Europe to arm itself against the Mohammedans. Several kings of France even took the cross and proclaimed a crusade. This was, however, done apparently for no other purpose than to afford the king an opportunity to collect some extraordinary taxes. The reasons for the cessation of the crusades are many. In the first place, they had all failed. Millions of lives and untold wealth had been squandered in the east, and nothing had been accomplished. The people of Europe lost faith in the movement. The crusading spirit was turned into other channels. In Spain the war was kept up with the Mohammedans. On the eastern frontiers of Germany crusades were carried on against the heathen Letts and Slavs. The heretics in the empire were put on the same plane as the infidels, and wars against them were declared to be as holy and deserving of the same rewards as those against the Mohammedans. Then, too, the national life of the countries was growing stronger. International struggles arising, all the forces of the country were needed at home. At the same time, the religious needs of the people were satisfied in another way. Gethsemanes, Via Dolorosas, and Calvaries were constructed in the west, and these artificial holy places came to be regarded with almost as much reverence as were their originals. The rising sale of indulgences also made it unnecessary to go on a long and dangerous journey to the Holy Land to win religious peace. The life of Europe grew larger, its interests more complex, and the fields of its activity more numerous. There was no longer any surplus of energy to be spent in such far-away enterprises.

*Why did  
the crusades  
cease?*

That the crusades failed to accomplish what they were organized to do is evident. Nor are the causes of this failure far to seek. The crusaders themselves were much to blame, both while on the way and after they reached the east. They were too lawless and mob-like. They lacked good leaders. The princes quarrelled constantly, and their personal ambitions, especially those of the Normans, kept them from working for the common good. The Greek emperors, too, followed a disastrous policy, although the conduct of the crusaders generally drove them to it. The struggle between the German emperors and the popes also had a baneful influence. The Italian cities came in for their share of the blame because they were interested so deeply in commerce that they often sacrificed the common interests to their selfish ends. Finally, the difficulty of colonizing so large a territory and of absorbing the Mohammedan population was so great that it could not be overcome.

The effects, both direct and indirect, of the crusades on Europe were great and varied. They did much to increase the power of the papacy, especially during the first hundred years. Urban II. was virtually at the head of Christian Europe, and his leadership of so popular a movement as the first crusade confirmed him in the high place in the mind of the Christian world. Chivalry was perhaps inevitable, but the crusades forced it to become organized and made of it the institution which it became. The military-monkish orders owed their existence wholly to the crusades. The conquests of the German Order among the heathen on the Baltic may be regarded as one of the most important of the indirect effects of the crusades.

The crusades helped destroy feudalism. The barons often sold their rights, privileges, lands, and other feudal possessions in order to get money to go on a crusade. The creation of a new nobility to offset the old was also hastened by the crusades. They diminished the number of feudal subjects of the lower class, and so created the demand for labourers which resulted in the

elevation of the serfs into a class of free day-labourers. They also had some effect on the process by which the kings were increasing their power at the expense of the nobles. They did not destroy feudalism, but they did much to weaken it. Since they brought together large numbers of people of all countries, they developed the consciousness of national differences. Each nation came to hate all the others, one of the necessary steps, apparently, in the development of nationality.

On commerce the effects of the crusades were most marked. Shipbuilding and commerce were largely increased, because they made the carriage of pilgrims between Europe and Asia so lucrative a business. *Commerce*

Many new objects of merchandise were now introduced into Europe. The crusades created and supplied a large demand in the west for wines, sugar, cotton, silk, all kinds of textile fabrics, rugs, pottery, glass-ware, spices, medicines, perfumes, colouring substances, incense, various kinds of oil, mastix, dates, grains, and many other things. It would not be too much to say that the crusades made Europe rich. The cities especially profited by the commerce, which greatly hastened the rise of the citizen or middle class. The crusades gave a strong impulse to literary activity. Many chronicles, histories, and poems were written about them, and the legends which grew out of them were innumerable. The literature of chivalry may be traced indirectly to the same impulse. Under their influence the great cycles of legends about Solomon, Troy, and Alexander the Great arose. In 1141 the Koran was translated into Latin. About the same time a school was established in Paris to teach the eastern languages, such as Armenian and Arabic.

Also Europe's fund of knowledge was generally increased. As regards zoology, the crusaders became acquainted with many animals which aroused their curiosity, and their interest resulted in the formation of zoological gardens, first of all in Sicily and Italy, in which strange animals were collected. Further, some new domestic animals were intro-

duced into Europe, such as the mule, the donkey, and the Arab horse.

In botany and practical farming Europe had much to learn from the Arabs. They taught the best methods of *Practical farming.* irrigation. The "Dutch" windmill is an Arabic invention, used for grinding corn and drawing water in the east, till it was introduced into Europe by the crusaders. Many new plants and grains were brought to the west, and experiments made in their cultivation.

In medicine and chemistry, which among the Arabs were closely related, the Christians learned of syrups, juleps, *Medicine and chemistry.* elixirs, camphor, senna, rhubarb, and similar articles. Many chemical terms, such as alembic, alcohol, alkali, borax, and amalgam, are Arabic in origin. The Arabs' knowledge of mathematics and astronomy has already been spoken of, and the intercourse between the Christians and the Mohammedans facilitated the spread to the west of the Arabic achievements in these subjects.

Most important of all, perhaps, was the general enlargement of the intellectual horizon of Europe, caused by the *The horizon of Europe enlarged* travel of the Christians in foreign lands, which had a different, higher, and finer civilization than their own. Life in the west was still very rude. The houses lacked all luxuries and comforts, and most of those things which are now regarded as necessities. The European, whose experiences had been very limited indeed, entered into a new world when he set out on a crusade. He found new climates, new natural products, strange dress, houses, and customs. The features of the landscape and even the skies above him were different, and in the houses he found many new objects of comfort and luxury. The geographical knowledge of the west was very limited, but the crusades brought experience in travel and a practical knowledge of large territories, so that an active interest was aroused in the study of geography. A good knowledge of the Mediterranean and of large parts of Asia and Africa was acquired. The curiosity awakened by the new regions, together with the mercenary

and commercial interests in many quarters, led Europeans to undertake long journeys of discovery. One of the most famous of the travellers of the Middle Age was Marco Polo, who traversed central Asia, visiting all the peoples of that region, and finally reaching even the Pacific. Other travellers, such as Andrew of Longjumeau, were only a little less famous. The published accounts of their travels were widely read, and, while adding information, they increased the interest of Europe in foreign lands. The influence of the crusades in this direction can hardly be overestimated. Without them the Renaissance could not have been what it was.

## CHAPTER XIII

### THE GROWTH OF THE CITIES

#### LITERATURE.—Zimmern, *Hansa*

Gross, *The Gild Merchant* 2 vols.

Jessopp, *Studies of a Recluse* Contains an article on the growth of the English towns.

#### OLD MEDIEVAL TOWNS. Symonds and Gordon, *Perugia*

Lynch, *Toledo*

Headlam, *Nuremberg*

Cook, *Rouen*

Zimmern, *Hansa*

Ashley, *English Economic History*

Luchaire, *Les Communes Françaises*

Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce*

Mrs R. Green, *English Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*

THE history of the cities of the Roman empire during the first ten centuries of the Christian era is obscure. In Gaul,

*The cities besides a larger number of strongholds (castra),  
in the there were more than one hundred cities (civitates)  
empire.* governed by the Roman municipal form of govern-

ment. In the fourth century they were all on the road to ruin because of the financial oppression which they endured from the emperor. The control of city government during or after the invasion of the barbarians passed into the hands of some bishop or nobleman of the neighbourhood; or sometimes the control was divided—the bishop holding

*Karl the one part of the city, and the nobleman the  
Great and remainder. Karl the Great introduced some uni-  
his system formity into the government of the cities by  
of counties.* putting each one of them under an officer with the title of count.

These counts were either churchmen or laymen, and were, in every case, responsible to Karl for their government

They ruled the cities in the emperor's name. But in the succeeding period, while the empire was being dismembered and feudalism established, these counts were able to assume a feudal proprietorship over the cities. Each city thus became a fief, the feudal possession of its count.

The Germans, it will be remembered, generally settled in the country. At the time of Karl the Great by far the larger number of the inhabitants of Gaul and Germany still lived in the country. The violence *New cities founded.* of the times, and especially the invasions of the Norsemen and Huns, compelled the people to live together in walled inclosures, and these in time became cities. Other cities sprang up around monasteries and castles. They were, of course, small in their beginnings and grew slowly. They also became involved in the prevalent feudal relations, and were governed by their feudal lord.

In accordance with the prevailing tendency of the age, the residents of the city had lost their full freedom. They were neither wholly free nor wholly enslaved, but *The inhabitants of the cities had lost their freedom.* were regarded as the possession of the lord of their city. Their condition did not differ very materially from that of the serfs. They had neither personal nor political freedom, since they had no voice in their own government. Their lord collected the taxes, appointed all officials, kept order, punished offenders, and was, in short, himself the whole government. The citizens were at the mercy of their lords. So long as the cities remained small, and city life undeveloped, such a state of affairs might continue to exist; but it is inconceivable that it should be tolerated after the cities became large, rich, and powerful. It is also evident that the inhabitants of the cities would strive after personal freedom and then for political liberty, or the right of local self-government.

A sort of basis or starting-point for the free commune of later times was the guilds. People who had common interests were brought together and united into *Guilds.* a secret organization known as a guild. Each occupation



had a separate guild, that worked at first only for its own interests, but later progress was made by the union of some of the guilds in the support of their common interests.

The principal causes of the communal revolt of the eleventh and twelfth centuries were the revival of industry and commerce, and consequent increase of wealth. It was the merchants who led in the movement, and the revolt spread along the routes of commerce and travel. During the tenth century efforts were made to put an end to private wars and to secure peace.

*Revival of industry and commerce.*

*Order brings commerce, wealth, and desire for liberty.*

Feudalism became more fixed in its customs and a certain degree of order prevailed, to which fact the revival of commerce is in large measure due. There was no revolt against the burdens imposed upon the cities by their lords until there grew up a rich merchant class, a sort of aristocracy of wealth, commanding resources and means of carrying on the struggle with the lord, but when this class became numerous the cities rebelled, and in the struggle that followed were able to secure not only personal freedom for their inhabitants, but also in many cases the right of governing themselves.

In Italy, as we have seen, the cities were able to free themselves entirely from the empire and the papacy and to become independent republics. But in France

*No city republics in France.*

this movement did not go to so great lengths: not a single French city became an independent republic; the French cities did not even succeed in ridding themselves entirely of their feudal lords. Even the cities which secured the largest amount of political liberty and the fullest freedom of self-government still recognized, in one way or another, the headship of their lords.

When first confronted with the demands of the cities, the lords thought only of resistance. It is only natural that they should have opposed anything which threatened to diminish their power and income. The refusal of the lord, however,

was generally followed by an appeal of the citizens to arms, and in this struggle the cities were nearly always successful. Other lords, of a more thrifty spirit, seeing in this movement an opportunity to replenish their purses, would sell to the cities the rights and privileges which they demanded. In this way many nobles were able to secure the money necessary to equip themselves for a crusade. Since the population and wealth of the cities rapidly increased as soon as they received their liberties, the income of their lords was rather increased than diminished by the change. With an eye to their own advantage, the lords now acceded to the demands of the cities more willingly.

*Liberty  
acquired by  
force or by  
purchase.*

The cities of France may be divided into three groups, according to the measure of freedom they succeeded in obtaining. The cities of the first group got little more than the personal liberty of their inhabitants and the reduction of some of their feudal dues. They were still ruled by a representative of their

*The first  
group, villes  
de bour-  
geoisie.*

lord, and had no voice in the election of their officials, or in the management of their affairs. The cities of this group, called *villes de bourgeoisie*, were principally in Normandy and Brittany. The cities of the second group, for the most part in southern France, secured the right to manage all the affairs of the city except the administration of justice. The courts remained in the hands of their lord. Imitating the action of the Italian cities, they set up a consular form of government. Their consuls were elected either by the whole population of the city, or by one or more of its guilds, and were confirmed by the lord of the city. These consuls were responsible to the lord of the city for their administration, and had to make their reports to him. As a mark of its freedom, the city had its seal, which was attached to all its official documents, but the lord, as a sign of his authority, kept the keys of the city in his possession.

*The second  
group, con-  
sular cities.*

*The seal  
and keys of  
the city.*

The third group consisted of the communes proper. The

sovereignty of the lord was recognized in two ways; the city paid him certain taxes and tolls, and gave him in all judicial matters the right to hear appeals. But he was excluded from the administration of the city's affairs, and the officials were in no way responsible to him. At the head of the administration was a mayor assisted by a council

The power in the commune was not generally vested in the whole body of its inhabitants, though there were a few cities

*The third group communes.* in which all inhabitants were members of the commune. It was more often the case that only the members of one or more guilds exercised political rights. Ordinarily, therefore, the commune was not

a republic, but a kind of oligarchy or aristocracy. As the commune developed in wealth and power, and membership in it increased in value, it became more and more difficult to enter, and the aristocratic or oligarchic character of the ruling body became more pronounced

Although the communes had gained their liberty they did not know how to preserve it. Their members were invariably

*Violence and mismanagement in the communes.* divided into factions, and feuds and street brawls were common. There were also social troubles coupled with the political difficulties. The lower orders were often ranged against the higher, the poor against the rich. The magistrates of the cities were generally hard masters, and those outside the ruling guilds were unmercifully imposed upon. This led to the formation of guilds among the workmen of other occupations who in the earlier time had been without such organizations. These, organizing themselves for opposition, sometimes succeeded in acquiring membership in the commune. Even if they failed to do this, they filled the city with violence. Peace had to be restored by some one from without, generally the king. Another cause of internal trouble was the bad administration of the finances of the city. The officials of the commune were often guilty of fraud and speculation, and it was impossible to bring such offenders to justice, because they refused to render any account of their doings to the people. They claimed that

they had done their duty when they had made their reports to each other. It is not surprising, therefore, that the cities often became bankrupt. The expenses of the communes, together with large sums that were taken from the treasury in a fraudulent way, far exceeded the regular income.

These two things, the insolvency of the communes and their lawlessness, were the real causes of their destruction. The kings of France were now steadily following the policy of collecting all power into their own hands, and the process of centralization was becoming more and more rapid. The nobles were gradually yielding to the kings, and the communes were made the object of a policy which, in the end, was sure to break them down. *The king and the communes.* The officials of the king's treasury interfered in the administration of the finances of the communes and punished all maladministration by seizing the charter of the commune and declaring it forfeited. The judicial jurisdiction of the communes was limited in every way. The *parlement*, which exercised the judicial power in France, tried to destroy the local tribunals by increasing the number of cases which could be settled only by the king or by his tribunal. The policy of *parlement* and sovereign was to make the king's justice prevalent throughout the land. The central authority also increased the taxes of the communes. As the king's power grew he interfered more and more in the affairs of the communes. He controlled their election and inspected their magistrates, he imposed heavy fines on all those communes which refused him obedience or offended him in the slightest way, he placed all kinds of burdens on them in order to break them down, and so when the day of reckoning came he had them in his power. He forced them to give up their charters and all that these stood for—their political independence and their privileges. This policy toward the communes may be said to date from Louis IX. (1227-70). Under Philip IV. (1285-1314) the seizures became frequent; and by the year 1400 the communes had lost all their acquired liberties, sunk back into dependence on the crown, and disappeared.

The processes by which the German cities acquired their freedom are extremely intricate and varied. Before the interregnum (1254-73) they had done little more than secure certain restrictions upon the arbitrary taxation of their lords, but during or after the interregnum, when the imperial power was practically destroyed, they were able to emancipate themselves rapidly, and in the end to secure political independence.

The cities in Germany were of two kinds: imperial cities (Reichsstaedte), subject to the emperor only, and seigniorial

*The cities.  
their gov-  
ernment* cities (Landesstaedte), subject to the princes. The power was usually in the hands of a few wealthy and ancient families (patriciate). From among these the burgomaster and the assisting council (Rath) were elected, who together formed the magistracy. The increasing industrial population was divided into guilds (Zuenfte), which, induced by the consciousness of their strength, began toward the end of the thirteenth century to aspire to a share in the government.

For the development of the cities and their commerce, peace and security were necessary; and, since the empire was weak, they banded together for mutual protection. In 1254 the cities of the lower Rhine formed a league for mutual protection.

*The Suabian  
League,  
1344.* In 1344 the cities of southern and south-western Germany made the famous Suabian League. Fearing that this league would become all-powerful, the

princes attacked it at Doeffingen (1388) and won a victory over it. The cities were forbidden to form such leagues in the future, and the princes supposed they had made an end of their foe. The cities, however, recovered from the blow, and increased their power and importance. Most famous of all

*The Hanse.* such leagues was the Hanse, an organization which included all the cities in the Baltic provinces, besides having its outposts in several other countries. Beginning in a small way in the thirteenth century, the Hanse steadily grew until it embraced about eighty-five cities, monopolized the trade, and practically ruled north-western Europe. From 1350 to 1500 the league was at the height of its power.

Its decline was caused by the changes in commerce and in the routes of travel and trade produced by the voyages of discovery some of the Hanse towns remained true to Roman Catholicism, while others, accepting the teachings of Luther, were drawn into the religious wars which followed the Reformation, and fought on opposing sides ; and as the governments of the various countries in which the cities were situated grew stronger the cities were separated from their foreign alliances, lost their independent character, and became component parts of the state to which they naturally belonged.

## CHAPTER XIV

### ITALY TO THE INVASION OF CHARLES VIII. (1494)

LITERATURE — Creighton, *History of the Papacy*.

Sismondi, *History of the Italian Republics* (an abstract of his *Republiques Italiennes*)

Machiavelli, *History of Florence* Contains also "The Prince" and "Savonarola."

Lodge, *The Close of the Middle Ages*. 1272-1494

Armstrong, *Lorenzo de' Medici*

Horatio Brown, *Venice*

Mrs Oliphant, *Makers of Florence*, and *Makers of Venice*

Oscar Browning, *Short History of Medieval Italy* 2 vols I *Guelphs and Ghibellines* 1250-1409 II. *Age of the Condottieri* 1409-1530

Duffy, *Tuscan Republics*.

Wiel, *Venice*.

Ewart, *Cosimo de' Medici*

BECAUSE of the different racial elements which were found there, the unification of Italy during the Middle Age was impossible. The people of the peninsula, thoroughly imbued with the Roman civilization, the Greeks of the south, the Germans of Odovaker, the East Goths, the Lombards, the Saracens, and the Normans, all were there; and each fought to obtain the mastery over all Italy. They had powerful rivals in the pope and the emperor for political honours, the conflict between whom gave the cities the opportunity to depose the imperial officers and to establish a local independent government similar to that of the communes described in the preceding chapter. Frederick I. tried to reduce the cities to a position of dependence again, but the Lombard League and the pope were too strong for him. The battle of Legnano (1176), and the treaty of

*Why the unification of Italy in the Middle Age was impossible.*

*The cities acquire constitutions and successfully resist the emperor.*

Constance (1183), gave the cities about all the independence they claimed, and left the emperor little except his title. After the death of Frederick II. few emperors tried to wield any authority in Italy.

Although the cities had acquired their liberty, this was no guarantee for peace and order, and they were engaged in constant feuds with each other. Only members of the ruling guilds had a share in the government, and the class distinctions among the inhabitants

*Feuds inside and outside the cities.*

formed a large disturbing element. The higher and the lower nobility and the rich merchants struggled for authority, disregarding the rights of the industrial classes. The pride and ambition of the nobles led them into feuds which filled the streets with violence. To put an end to this confusion the cities began to elect dictators called *podestà* (about 1200). The lower orders of society were, at the

*Podestà.*

same time, striving to win a share in the government. They had organized themselves into guilds and now united in a commune of their own with a "captain of the people" (*capitan del popolo*) at its head, as a rival of the *podestà*. War between the parties began. The privileged classes sought the aid of the emperor and were called Ghibelline, while the common people joined with the pope and were called Guelf. These civil wars fill the thirteenth century. They ended in the loss of the republican constitutions, and the cities fell into the hands of tyrants.

*Ghibelline and Guelf.*

About 1300 the political condition of Italy was somewhat as follows: In Piedmont the old feudal system was still in force; several great barons, among them the counts of Savoy, the ancestors of the present royal house of Italy, were contending for supremacy. In Lombardy the cities were ruled by tyrants: Milan by the family of the Visconti, Verona by the Scaligers, Padua by the Carraresi, Mantua by the Gonzaghi, Ferrara by the Estensi. In Tuscany the cities were in the throes of civil war, but the end was to be the same as in Lombardy. In the states of the Church the cities were

*The five powers in Italy: Venice, Lombardy, Tuscany, Rome, and Naples.*



about to break away from papal control. The long residence of the popes in Avignon (1309-78) permitted the rise of tyrannies in Urbino, Perugia, Rimini, and elsewhere, while Bologna became a republic and Rome tried several political experiments. Naples was the seat of the kingdom of the Angevins, and Sicily had passed into the possession of the Aragonese. Genoa and Venice were independent republics. While the disunion at this time was very great, the five powers which were to divide Italy among themselves in the fifteenth century were showing signs of their coming strength. Their history may be briefly traced as follows:

Genoa and Venice owed their greatness to their commerce. For some time Pisa was a strong rival of Genoa in

*Genoa.* the commerce and control of the western Mediterranean, but in the battle of Meloria (1284), just off Pisa, the Genoese fleet was victorious and the power of Pisa was broken. In 1261 Genoa helped the Greek emperor to regain Constantinople, and received as her reward the monopoly of the trade in the Black Sea. But Genoa thus came into conflict with Venice, which, by the outcome of the fourth crusade had gained the ascendancy in the east. The war between the two cities lasted more than two hundred years and ended in the total defeat of the Genoese in the battle of Chioggia (1380). After this Genoa declined, while Venice became the mistress of the Mediterranean.

Since 697 Venice had been ruled by a doge (duke) elected by the people. The tendency in the city, however, was

*Venice.* toward an oligarchy. Toward the end of the twelfth century the Great Council, consisting of four hundred and eighty members, usurped the right to elect the doge. They associated with him a small council of six, and for all more important matters a council of sixty. In 1297 the oligarchy was completed by the act known as the "Closing of the Great Council," by which this body declared itself to be hereditary. In order to check all popular movements the Great Council established the Council of Ten with unlimited police powers. The bloody work of this Council

prevented all uprisings of the people and gave the government of the city a stability and durability which were possessed by no other in Italy. Venice acquired not only the islands of the eastern Mediterranean, but also much territory on the main-land of the Balkan peninsula. Then she turned her arms toward Italy and conquered Treviso, Padua, Vicenza, and other places. But her expansion on the main-land of Italy during the fifteenth century brought her in turn into conflict with Milan.

In Milan the Ghibelline Visconti overcame the family of the Gueff della Torre and entered on a vigorous policy of territorial extension. By the year 1350 the Visconti had conquered and annexed all Lom- *Milan.* bardy. Gian Galeazzo (1385-1402), the ablest of the family, pushed his conquests so far to the south that he encroached on the territory of Florence. The Family of the Visconti died out, however, in 1447, and the power in Lombardy was seized by several condottieri, as the leaders of the mercenary bands were called, who had been in the service of the Visconti and of various cities. Every such leader now improved the opportunity and made himself master of some city. In Milan the power was seized by Francesco Sforza, the most famous of all the condottieri. The city engaged him to lead its troops against the Venetians, and after securing a victory over them he came back to Milan and compelled the people to acknowledge him as their duke (1450).

The political history of Florence in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is so confused by party struggles that we cannot follow it here in detail. The factions *Florence.* known as the Blacks and the Whites, the old nobility, the old guilds, the new nobility of wealth, and the guilds of the lower orders, all fought for recognition and power and added to the chaos of the times. Taking advantage of these troubles the Medici rose to power. The Medici were a family of bankers that had grown rich and now used their wealth to advance their political aspirations. They saw that the power was really with the common people, and so

threw in their lot with them. In this way the head of the family, although he left the constitution intact, became the real ruler of the city. All the officials of the city were named by, and were subject to, him. Lorenzo the Magnificent (1469-92) finally swept away all the old republican offices and ruled with a Privy Council of Seventy of his own nomination. Under the Medici Florence made war on her small neighbours and became master of all Tuscany.

During the residence of the popes in Avignon Rome suffered from the violent struggles between the rival factions of her nobility as well as from the riotous conduct of the people. The families of the Colonna and the Orsini filled the streets with brawls. An uprising of the people in 1347 made Rienzi Tribune, with full powers to restore order. He drove out the turbulent nobles, but became so puffed up over his success that the people found him intolerable and exiled him. He went to Prague to appeal to the emperor, but was delivered to the pope, who kept him in prison for some time. The pope then determined to recover his power in Rome, and sent Rienzi back to the city as his representative (1354). Rienzi's success in Rome was of short duration, however, and he lost his life in an insurrection. Cardinal Albornozy was then sent by the pope into Italy, and recovered nearly all the towns in the papal state. This led the pope to take up his residence in Rome again (1377), although a rival pope was elected, who continued the papal court at Avignon till the schism was healed by the Council of Constance (1417). The popes of the fifteenth century followed the policy of making their possession of Rome secure and of uniting and enlarging the papal state.

The Angevins lost Sicily to the Aragonese, but held Naples till 1435, when Alphonso of Aragon made himself master of southern Italy also. The rule of the Angevins had ruined the kingdom, however, and although Alphonso was a model prince, a patron of learning and of the arts, he was not able to establish his family firmly in power. His son Ferdinand (1458-94) succeeded him as ruler

of Naples, but his misrule led to the revival of the Angevin claim, which had in the meanwhile reverted to the king of France Louis XI was too practical to be drawn into Italian politics, but his incompetent son Charles VIII. (1483-98), *Charles VIII. invades Italy,* was induced by various considerations to invade <sup>1494</sup> Italy. There was, first of all, his claim to Naples; Milan was intriguing against the Aragonese and urged him therefore to come; Savonarola was calling for a reform in Florence and attacking the rule of the Medici, thus opening an opportunity in Florence. In 1494 he crossed the Alps and began that long and disastrous period of foreign invasion and domination of Italy which was not ended till the present century

*Note.*—The famous parties of Ghibelline and Guelf find their origin in the houses of the Henrys of Weiblingen, and of the Welfs of Altorf. In the long struggle between the Empire and the Papacy, the supporters of the Emperors were known as Ghibellines, those of the Popes as Guelfs.

## CHAPTER XV

FRANCE, 1108-1494; ENGLAND, 1070-1485

LITERATURE —Mrs J. R. Green, *Henry II, and Township in the Fifteenth Century*

Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England, and The Early Plantagenets*

Blaauw, *The Baron's War*

Jessopp, *The Coming of the Friars*

Tout, *Edward I*

Hutton, *King and Barons*

Oman, *The Hundred Years' War, and Warwick, the Kingmaker.*

G. W. Prothero, *Simon de Montfort*

Bemont, *Simon de Montfort, Comte de Leicester*

Creighton, *Simon de Montfort*

Hassall, *A Class Book of English History (449-1900.)*

Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe.*

Lechler, *John Wycliffe, and His English Precursors.*

Sergeant, *Wycliffe.*

Poole, *John Wycliffe and the Early Movements of Reform.*

Townsend Warner, *Landmarks in English Industrial History.*

Church, *Henry V*

Morley, *Chaucer.*

Gardner, *Lancaster and York, and Richard III.*

Gasquet, *The Great Pestilence*

Jusserand, *English Wayfaring Life*

Ramband, *Histoire de la Civilisation en France*

Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*

Luchaire, *Les Communes Francaises, and Histoire des Institutions Monar-  
chiques*

Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy.*

Lodge, *The End of the Middle Ages*

*The Student's History of France*

Lowell, *Joan of Arc*

Tuckey, *Joan of Arc*

Lamartine, *Joan of Arc*

Kitchin, *History of France*

Hutton, *Philip Augustus*

Willert, *Louis XI.*

THE accession of Louis VI. (1108-37, called the Fat) marks a change in the fortunes of the Capetian House. All but the

last years of his life were spent in passing through his kingdom, punishing the rebellious barons, asserting his royal rights, acquiring territory, and, in general, in increasing the prestige of the royal name. He was a staunch champion of the Church, protecting the clergy and their lands from the violence of the barons.

*France from  
1108 to the  
Hundred  
Years' War.*

He favoured the cities, and tried to make travel safe and commerce secure. Suger, the able abbot

*Louis VI.,  
1108-37.*

of St Denis, as his counsellor, was of great service to him in the difficult work which he had to do. Though he was unable to reduce the great vassals, he was one of the ablest of the Capetian line, and until his increasing corpulence made travel impossible, he spent his time and strength in the personal supervision of the government. He was succeeded by his son, Louis VII (1137-80), who was simple, credulous, capricious, and over-religious. So long as Suger

*Louis VII.,  
1137-80.*

lived, Louis was well guided, but he made the mistake of going on a crusade and of divorcing his wife, Eleanor, who held all of Aquitaine. He intrigued with the sons of Henry II. of England, but was unable to prevent the English from obtaining a large amount of French territory.

His son, Philip II, called Augustus (1180-1223), although a politician of rare ability, was treacherous and unscrupulous.

He, too, intrigued with the English princes, and thereby secured the possession of Normandy,

*Philip II.,  
1180-1223.*

Maine, Anjou, and other provinces. For some years he waged war on his great vassals and wrung many concessions from them. The battle of Bouvines was quite as advantageous to him as to Frederick II. of Germany, for whom it was ostensibly fought. Philip took no personal part in the persecution of the Albigenses, but the crown reaped the benefit of it by acquiring their territory.

The reign of Philip II. was of fundamental importance for the growth of the royal power. The king's domain was more than doubled by him, and his income correspondingly increased. For the first time the king was rich. Philip II. found the old system of administration insuffi-

*The royal  
domain.*

cient. His estates had thus far been managed by a *prévôt*, who, in the name of the king, administered justice, collected the taxes, and preserved order. Although these *prévôts* were the king's officers, there was the tendency, in accordance with the character of the age, for them to look upon their office as a fief, and hence hereditary. To keep them from growing quite away from him, and also to get the best returns from his estates, Philip II created a new officer, the *baillie*. He was put above the *prévôts*, several of whom were generally in his bailiwick. He was required to hold court every month for the rendering of justice and to make a full report of his doings to the king. He was especially intrusted with collecting all the money possible for the king and delivering it at Paris. The reign of Philip II. had resulted in two most important things—the great extension of the royal power and the better administration of the royal affairs. The hereditary character of the crown seemed so well established in his reign that he did not think it necessary to secure the election of his son, taking it for granted that the crown would pass on to him.

Although Louis VIII. (1223–26) was thirty-six years old when his father died, he had never had any share in the *Louis VIII.*, government or any independent income. He followed his father's policy in all respects, except that he gave to each of his sons the government and income of a certain territory, which was called an appanage. While this made the position of the princes more dignified, it tended to separate lands from the crown at a time when everything possible should have been done to consolidate the royal possessions.

For ten years after the accession of Louis IX. (1226–70), his mother, Blanche of Castile, was regent. Imperious and autocratic, she ruled with a strong hand; and although conspired against by almost all the great vassals, she was able to add to the royal power. Under her training Louis became the most perfect Christian ruler of his day. Few men have ever taken Christianity so

*Louis IX.,  
the Saint,  
1226–70*

seriously and followed its dictates, even against their own interests, so closely as he. His religious conscience was absolute master of him. He refused to extend his boundaries at the expense of his neighbours, although many opportunities for doing so offered themselves. He even restored to England certain territories which he thought had been unjustly seized. He was deeply distressed by the enmity between the emperor and the pope, and tried to act as peacemaker between them. His reputation for justice made him the arbiter of Europe, and the Church expressed her approval of his character by declaring him a saint.

The reign of Louis IX is important for various reasons. He increased the royal domain by the acquisition of several large provinces. Up to this time more than eighty of his subjects had had the right to coin money. *Reform.* The money coined in a province was the only legal tender there. Louis made the royal money legal tender throughout France, and issued stringent laws against counterfeiting. He reformed the office of *baillie* by prescribing that every *baillie* should take an oath to administer his office faithfully and justly, and to preserve local liberties as well as the rights of the king; that he should not receive any money or gift from the people in his bailiwick, nor engage in any other business, nor have any interest in his bailiwick except to serve the king; that he should not marry any one from his district, nor surround himself with his relatives, nor give them any office under him. Every *baillie* was ordered to hold court in person, regularly, and in the appointed places, and to make reports to the king of all his doings, and after being removed from his office was to remain in the province for forty days, in order that the opportunity might be given to prefer charges against him.

Around the person of the king there was a large number of people of different rank, who formed his court. The highest in rank of these were his council. Up to this time all this court had helped him in the administration of the affairs of government. Louis IX. introduced the principle of division



of labour by dividing this council into three groups, and assigning to each a particular kind of work. These divisions were the council proper, the officers of the treasury, and the *parlement*. The council retained the executive functions of the government. The treasury officials had charge of the collection and disbursement of all the moneys of the king, while the *parlement* became the highest judicial body in the realm. Previous to this time the administration of justice had been made very difficult, because the king was constantly travelling from one part of the kingdom to another. And since his council accompanied him, and all cases must be tried in, or near, his presence, all the parties to a case were compelled to follow him about; and often several weeks, or even months, would elapse before a case might come to trial. To remedy this, Louis established the *parlement* in Paris and gave it a fixed place of meeting.

The jurisdiction of the *parlement* was also extended. The revival of the study of Roman law brought out the imperial principle that the king is the source of all justice. The theory arose that the jurisdiction of the nobles was a fief held of the king. It followed as a matter of course that every one should have the right of appealing to the king in case he were not satisfied with the result of his trial, and also that the king might call before his court any case that he might wish. For various reasons the king wished to make the number of these "royal cases" as large as possible, and so interfered more and more in the baronial courts, and brought all the important cases before his own judges. Louis forbade the trial by duel and put in its stead the appeal to a higher court. The *parlement*, therefore, became the court of appeal over all the baronial courts, and the king's justice became superior to all baronial justice.

While Louis was truly religious in accordance with the ideas of his age, and defended the Church against all violence and injustice, he nevertheless guarded his royal prerogatives

against clerical encroachments. He compelled the Church to contribute its part toward the support of the government by the payment of tithes and other taxes. He limited, to a certain extent, the judicial power of the bishops, and subjected a part of the clergy to the civil law. He greatly favoured the mendicant orders at the expense of the clergy, using them as ambassadors, as *missi dominici*, and in many of its highest offices.

With the accession of Philip III. (1270-85) favourites made their appearance at the French court, behind whom the king hides so successfully as to conceal his real character. These favourites were generally of the common people, capable, ambitious, and trained in the Roman law, from which fact they were called *légistes*. They were generally hated by the nobility, who regarded them in the light of usurpers. Philip III. was drawn into a war with some of the kingdoms in Spain, which led to his acquisition of Navarre. He also added to the royal domain several other important territories in the south of France. He punished his rebellious vassals with great severity, and compelled the Church to pay well for the privilege of receiving legacies. In order to secure immunity from the laws of the land, men took the tonsure and were called clergymen, and yet engaged in business or led a wandering or vagabond sort of life, many of them being married, and living in all respects as laymen. These he deprived of the protection of the Church law, and subjected to taxation and other state control.

Under the rule of Philip IV. (1285-1314), called the Handsome, France became the leading power in Europe. His favourites furnished him with a policy: he strove to imitate Justinian. The influence of the Roman law at his court may be seen from the fact that a large number of great questions were settled by the form of trial. Philip IV. chose the most opportune times of interfering in the affairs of the provinces which, being on the eastern frontier, owed allegiance to the German emperor. Since the emperors

were all weak, he was able to extend his boundaries considerably at the expense of the empire

The commanding position of Philip IV. in Europe is shown by the removal of the papacy to Avignon, and the control which he exercised over the popes. *The papacy removed to Avignon.* Clement V., in order to escape from condemning his predecessor, Boniface VIII, delivered the Order of the Templars into the king's hands. *Destruction of the Templars.* Heavy charges were trumped up against it, but the real motive of the king was to secure possession of its vast wealth.

In the time of Philip IV. order was introduced into the government by the creation of certain new offices, the functions of which were defined. The various sorts of work in the government were differentiated and each sort assigned to a particular set of officials. *Improvements in the government* For the personal service of the king there was a court called at that time the king's "*Hotel*", the chamberlain, the chaplain, and those who had control of the guard and the troops were the most important persons of the Hotel. The "*chancellerie*" had charge of all public affairs. By means of it all intercourse between the king and his people was conducted. Within the *chancellerie* there was a college of notaries who drew up all public or state documents. The heads of this college were called "*clerks du secret*," or private secretaries of the king, because they were acquainted with the secrets of the king and his council. The third chief division in the government was called the King's Council, the members of which had to take a special oath to the king. They were his secret counsellors and deliberated with him on all important questions. *The States-general.* The States-general<sup>1</sup> were not yet an organic part of the government. The attendance upon these, however, had in

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that "States-general" correspond to the Parliament in England, while in France the name *Parlement* was given to the body of the king's judges. The *Parlement* in France is a judicial body; in England the Parliament is a legislative body.

the process of time come to be limited to the more powerful nobles and to the abbots and bishops. It had been customary for the king to summon them to obtain their advice whenever the special situation demanded. In 1302, when the trouble with the pope was assuming large proportions, the king felt that he must know whether he would have the support of all his people if he proceeded to extreme measures against the papacy. He therefore summoned the States-general, and at the same time called on the cities each to send two or three representatives to attend the meeting. The king laid before them his plans and asked for their judgment. After some deliberation, the body signified its approval and promised him the support of the whole people. In 1308, a similar meeting of the same body was held to discuss the charges against the Templars. More than two hundred cities sent their representatives, and again the States-general merely said "yes" to the king's proposals. It is characteristic of the part which the cities played in this proceeding that they were "asked by the king to send deputies to hear, receive, approve, and do all that might be commanded them by the king." Again, in 1314, when the war with Flanders was about to be renewed and the treasury was empty, the king summoned the States-general and told them what he wanted. The States-general did nothing but express their submission to the will of the king. This was the much-written-about entrance of the Third Estate into the political history of France. French historians never tire of exalting its importance. But, as a matter of fact, the influence of the Third Estate was, and remained, practically nothing till the time of the French Revolution. It had no such history and development as the House of Commons in England. In France the authority of the king prevailed, and the Third Estate was simply permitted to say "yes" when it was commanded so to do.

The growth of the *parlement* during this reign was remarkable. Ordinary cases arising on the royal domain were tried before it, and the number of appeals from all parts of the

kingdom greatly increased. The absolute supremacy of the king's court and the king's justice over all baronial courts and baronial justice was more than ever recognized. The right of appeal was made use of to such an extent that the king was compelled to empower his *baillies* to decide many cases in order to prevent the *parlement* from being overwhelmed with work.

As the government grew more thoroughly organized, it became much more expensive. Louis IV had always had enough income to support the government. Philip IV. was always in debt. He made the most strenuous efforts to raise money, but even by taxes, seizures, aids, forced loans, confiscations, persecutions of the Jews, taxation of all the foreign merchants in France, taxation of the Church, the seizure of the possessions of the Templars, and many other questionable means, was not able to keep his treasury full.

Philip IV. was succeeded by his three sons in turn: Louis X. (1314-16), Philip V., called the Long (1316-22), and Charles IV. (1322-28). They were not able to preserve the monarchy in that state to which their predecessors had brought it. There was a general reaction on the part of the nobles against the absolutism of Philip IV., and they were able to force from these kings many provincial charters which restored and safeguarded local feudal rights. Louis X. especially made a large number of such concessions.

Philip V. laboured hard to strengthen the government and centralize the power. He met, however, with the most bitter opposition from his barons. All three brothers died without male heirs, and since Philip V., in order to justify his seizure of the crown, had prevailed on the Council to declare that the crown could not pass by the female line, the throne was vacant. The nearest male heir was Philip of Valois, a cousin of the dead king. Edward III of England also laid claim to the crown on the ground that he, being a nephew of the late king Charles IV., was the nearest

*End of the direct Capetian line, accession of the House of Valois, 1328.*

male heir by the female line. The claims of Edward were rejected and Philip of Valois became king. Edward soon gave up all pretensions to the throne, came to Amiens, and did homage to Philip VI. for his feudal holdings. In 1330, and again in 1331, he acknowledged himself without any reserve as the feudal subject of the king of France.

Norman genius showed itself in the government of William the Conqueror. The name of what was formerly called the Witenagemot, composed of all who held land directly from the king, was gradually changed to Great Council. Both his Norman and his English subjects were troublesome, but he used the one to keep the other in check. In the large towns he built fortresses which he garrisoned with Norman troops. He kept the English militia ready for service. He had made an exact list of the possessions and holdings of all his subjects, which was called the Domesday Book, and on the basis of which he levied and collected his taxes with great regularity and exactness. His severity in punishing all offences, his heavy taxes, and his devastation of a large territory to make a game preserve caused him to be hated by his people, who did not understand the great services he was rendering England.

The reign of William Rufus (1087-1100), the second son of William the Conqueror, was violent and oppressive in the extreme. He laid such heavy financial burdens on the people, that they were not sorry when he met his death while hunting in the New Forest. The eldest son of William, Robert, had received the duchy of Normandy, which he had pawned in order to go on the first crusade. The third son, Henry, was made king of England (1100-35). Fearing that his title to the crown was not good, and that Robert would probably oppose him, he tried to propitiate the people in every possible way. He published a charter of liberties which contained concessions to the Church, the

*England,  
from 1070  
to the*

*Hundred  
Years' War.*

*William the  
Conqueror.*

*The Domes-  
day Book.*

*William II.,  
1087-1100.*

*Henry I.,  
1100-35,  
publishes a  
charter of  
liberties.*

vassals, and the nation at large, and assured all classes that they would no longer be subjected to the wrongs and exactions which they had suffered from his brother.

Henry increased his popularity by marrying the daughter of the king of Scotland, Matilda, a descendant from the old English line of kings. The wisdom of his conduct became apparent when Robert, returning from the crusade, tried to get possession of England and the people stood faithfully by Henry. Robert was taken prisoner in battle, and Henry seized Normandy. Henry was the first English king to grant charters to towns, thus securing them against unjust interference from their feudal lords, as well as from excessive taxes and tolls. He established the institution known as the *curia*

*The curia regis* (of which a department called the *Exchequer regis* had control of the king's finances), which tried all

cases in which the king's tenants-in-chief were concerned. He obtained an oath from his barons that they would accept his daughter Matilda as ruler, but at his death his nephew,

*Stephen of Blois*, Stephen of Blois (1135-54), came to London and secured his own election. War ensued between 1135-54.

Stephen and Matilda, and England suffered much from it till 1153, when it was agreed that Stephen should remain king, but should be succeeded by Henry, the son of Matilda.

Henry II. (1154-89) was strong, active, and able, and had *Henry II.*, but one thought, namely, to make himself the 1154-89. real master of England. Both the nobility and the Church were in his way. His reign is famous for his struggles with those powers.

For the purposes of consultation, he called the Great Council together often, and compelled many of the small feudal holders to attend it. The *curia regis* was also strengthened and its work of rendering justice emphasized. In 1166 he called a meeting of the Great Council at Clarendon

*Assize of Clarendon*, and published a set of decrees called the Assize of Clarendon. By its terms the old custom of compurgation was prohibited, and a new system was introduced. Twelve men in every county and four men from

each township in it were to form a board for the purpose of deciding who should be brought to trial—the work of our grand jury Henry revived the custom of sending out itinerant justices, who, by rendering strict justice in the king's name, brought the manorial and county courts into disfavour. In 1170 Henry inquired into the way in which the various barons who held the office of sheriff were performing their duties, and as the result of the inquiry turned nearly all out and replaced them by men of lower birth, who served from this time as a check on the higher nobility. Henry commuted the military service which his barons owed him to the payment of a sum of money (*scutage*), with which he hired mercenaries. He also re-organized the militia, and required all the people to come at his call, equipped ready to fight at their own expense.

The clergy were opposed to Henry's ideas of judicial reform because he meant to bring them also under his own jurisdiction. In 1164 he published the Constitutions of Clarendon, the purpose of which was to destroy the judicial independence of the clergy. *The Constitutions of Clarendon, 1164.*

"Every election of bishop or abbot was to take place before royal officers, in the king's chapel, and with the king's assent. The prelate-elect was bound to do homage to the king for his lands before consecration and to hold his lands as a barony from the king, subject to all feudal burdens of taxation and attendance in the king's court. No bishop might leave the realm without the royal permission. No tenant-in-chief or royal servant might be excommunicated, or their land placed under interdict, but by the king's assent. What was new was the legislation respecting ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The king's court was to decide whether a suit between clerk and laymen whose nature was disputed belonged to the Church courts or the king's. A royal officer was to be present at all ecclesiastical proceedings in order to confine the bishop's court within its own due limits, and the clerk once convicted there passed at once under the civil jurisdiction. An appeal was left from the archbishop's court to the king's court



for defect of justice, but none might appeal to the papal court save with the king's consent."

Thomas Beket as chancellor had been a faithful servant of Henry, and had supported him in all his efforts. On being made archbishop of Canterbury, however, Thomas Beket. changed his point of view and opposed the king in his attempts to control the clergy. The king was embittered; and some of his followers, interpreting his words to mean that he desired the death of Thomas, murdered the archbishop. Henry disavowed the deed, did penance at the tomb of Beket, and offered a part of Ireland, which he had just conquered, as a peace offering to the pope. He also withdrew the obnoxious Constitutions of Clarendon, whereupon the pope pardoned him and restored him to his favour.

Henry's last years were made bitter by the revolts of his sons. He died in 1189, leaving the crown to Richard I. Richard I., (1189-99), who spent only a few months in 1189-99. England, and whose reign is only negatively important, in that his absence from the country gave English local independence an opportunity to grow.

John (1199-1216) had much of the ability and all the vices of the Angevin family. He had great political and diplomatic insight, but he was utterly without honour; unscrupulous to the last degree, he would break his royal oath without compunction. He refused his subjects in Angoulême justice, they appealed to the king of France, who summoned John before him. John, however, disregarded the summons, whereupon Philip II. deposed him and overran a large part of his French provinces. The murder of his nephew, Arthur, has made John infamous. John refused to accept Stephen Langton, who had been appointed archbishop of Canterbury by Innocent III. Innocent put England under the interdict and excommunicated John, and finally (1212) even deposed him and offered his crown to the king of France. At the same time John's violence and injustice to his people led the Church and barons to unite against him.

Hoping to break the opposition, John made peace with the pope and received his crown from him as a fief. But the struggle with his barons and Church continued until 1215, when he was compelled to grant Magna Carta, *The Magna Carta*, in which he promised to observe the ancient laws and customs, to abate all wrongs, and to require only the legal feudal dues. The Church was to have her liberties restored; the barons and the people were to be subject to no violence. The king agreed neither to pass nor to execute any judgment upon any one till he had been tried by his peers. After securing this charter of their liberties, the barons broke up into parties. John then ignored his oath and became more violent than ever toward his subjects, whereupon the barons offered the crown to Louis, the son of Philip II. Louis invaded England, and had some success, but at the death of John the English turned to his son, Henry III., then only nine years old. Louis was compelled to return to France.

Henry III. (1216-72) was very unlike his father. He was pious and kindly, but at the same time vain and changeable. He never refused to take any oath demanded of him, but always broke it at the first opportunity. While England suffered from his bad government, the Church was heavily taxed by the pope. While Simon de Montfort attempted to reform the state, Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, opposed the pope's exactions. In 1257 the crops were a total failure, but the pope demanded one-third of the income of the year. Being unable to bear these burdens longer, the barons came armed to Oxford and compelled the king to make certain concessions (the Provisions of Oxford, 1258). Later, when the king refused to keep his word, the barons, under the leadership of Simon de Montfort, made war on him. In 1265 Simon called a meeting of the Great Council, or Parliament, as it was now called, in which, besides the barons and knights from the shires, two citizens from certain towns also sat. Simon had summoned them to be present in order that they might give advice in regard to the taxes which

could be levied on the towns. This is the first occasion on which the representatives of the towns were summoned in conjunction with those of the counties. The civil war ended with the death of Simon and the withdrawal of Henry from the government, all authority being placed in the hands of Prince Edward.

The reign of Edward I. was marked by the conquest of Wales (1284) and of Scotland (1305), although Scotland renewed the war, and in 1314, by the battle of Bannockburn, recovered her independence. His legislation was for the most part good, and tended to increase the power of the crown. In 1295 the Constitution of Parliament was completed, and in 1297 Edward agreed to the Confirmation of the Charters. Edward II. (1307-1327) was controlled by favourites, and his reign was in every respect a failure. His wife and her paramour, Roger Mortimer, made war on him, and in 1327 the people joined them and deposed him. He was murdered a short time afterwards in prison, and Edward III. became king under the regency of Mortimer.

During the Hundred Years' War England was ruled in turn by Edward III. (1327-77), Richard II (1377-99), Henry IV (1399-1412), Henry V (1413-22), and Henry VI. (1422-61). During the same period the rulers of France were Philip VI. (1328-50), John (1350-64), Charles V. (1364-80), Charles VI. (1380-1422), and Charles VII. (1422-61).

The real question at issue in the Hundred Years War was whether the king of France should control all France, or whether the king of England should continue to hold Guenne and Gascony. England held so large a part of France as to be able to prevent the unification of that country, and the possession of all the French soil had come to be the most important question that confronted the king of France. The struggle between England and France was sure to come, and it could end in

but one of two ways. either the king of England must conquer the whole country and displace the French king, or the king of France must drive out the English, and reconquer all that territory which the topography of the country and the similarity in language and customs had marked out as a legitimate object of his ambition.

Edward and Philip first quarrelled about Scotland. In 1331 Edward Balliol laid claim to the crown of Scotland, and asked help of Edward III. David Bruce, the other claimant, fled to France. Philip VI. was trying to extend his authority over the Low countries, and Edward III. received some of their political refugees, thereby offending Philip VI. In 1338 the Hundred Years' War began. In that year Edward III. went to Flanders and the people demanded that he should assume the title of king of France; he saw the advantages to be derived from it, and, as a kind of war measure, in 1339 declared himself its possessor. In the same year the English fleet destroyed the French fleet, but otherwise little fighting was done till 1346, when Edward won the battle of Crécy, and the next year took Calais. A truce was then made, which was kept till 1355. In that year prince Edward, known as the Black Prince, ravaged a large part of southern France. Near Poitiers his force of 8000 men was attacked by an army of about 50,000 men, but he was victorious, and even captured king John and took him to England. In 1359 Edward made another invasion of southern France, but found there such suffering and ruin, as the result of his raid of a few years before, that he was conscience-smitten, and offered to make peace. By the terms of the treaty of Brétigny Edward resigned his claim to the French crown and received several large provinces from France. The Black Prince was sent to govern Aquitaine, but by his attempt to levy a hearth-tax caused an uprising of the people. For a few years the English harried many parts of France, but the French refused to engage in battle, and gradually recovered most of the country.

*Origin of  
the War.*

*Crécy, 1346*

*Poitiers,*

*1356.*

*The peace of  
Brétigny,  
1360.*

The war practically ceased till the accession of Henry V (1413-22). His father, Henry IV., had deposed Richard II.

*Henry V.,  
1413-22, re-  
news the  
war*

and seized the crown. Henry V, feeling that his claim to the crown was not secure, hoped to make himself popular by a successful war in France.

He renewed his claim to the French crown and invaded France, but at Harfleur lost two-thirds of his troops by disease. However, with an army of about 15,000 men he

*Agincourt,  
1415.* met and defeated 50,000 French near Agincourt

(1415) Charles VI was imbecile, and the country divided between two parties, the one under the duke of Burgundy, the other under the count of Armagnac. The feud between them was so bitter that the Burgundians went over to the English. By the treaty of Troyes (1420) Henry V. was acknowledged regent of France, and was to be recognized as king at the death of Charles VI.

In 1422 both kings died. Henry VI, though only a child of nine months, was acknowledged in England and in all the

*Henry VI.  
of England  
king of both  
countries.*

northern part of France, and the duke of Bedford was made regent. Bedford instituted excellent reforms and governed France well. Charles VII.,

the Dauphin, was recognised south of the Loire.

Bedford made war on him, and it seemed for a time that the English must gain possession of all of France. Bedford was

besieging Orléans (1428) with every prospect of success.

Some of the French nobles, however, especially the duke of Burgundy, were alienated from the English cause, and at the same time help came from an unexpected quarter.

Jeanne d'Arc, a peasant girl, seventeen years old, believed herself to have received a commission from God to lead her

*Jeanne  
d'Arc.*

king, Charles VII., to Rheims, to secure his coronation, and to drive out the English. She was not

the only woman in France who thought herself appointed for this difficult work. In those times of excitement and national depression other women came forward with the same belief in their high calling. Jeanne was the only one fortunate and capable enough to get a hearing. No one at first had any

confidence in her, but since there was no other help possible she was taken before the young king, who determined to give her a chance to test her divine calling. She was given command of the army, but only a part of her orders were obeyed, because some of the things which she commanded were manifestly impossible. The real commanders of the army made good use of her presence to fire the enthusiasm of the troops to the highest pitch. She led the attack on the English before Orléans, and was successful in breaking up the siege of the city. The tide turned and every one was wild with joy and enthusiasm. The belief in her miraculous mission made the army irresistible. The English were driven back, town after town was taken by the French, and Charles VII was soon crowned at Rheims (1429). Jeanne continued the struggle, but was taken prisoner by the Burgundians and sold to the English. She was carried to Rouen, where, after a long trial, she was condemned to death on a mixed charge of sorcery, heresy, apostasy, and other crimes, which only the Middle Age could invent. Her youth, her simplicity, her nobleness availed nothing, she was burned at the stake (May 1431).

But even dead she was still a power in France. Her name gave an impetus and courage to her countrymen which was destined to result in driving out the English entirely. Bedford found the current in France setting stronger and stronger against the English. At his death (1435) the duke of Burgundy deserted the English cause and became the subject of Charles VII. For some years the war was continued, but at length (1453) the English had been driven out of every place in France except Calais. The Hundred Years' War was over. The final result of it was the unification of France. By it both England and France had been profoundly influenced, and at its close they were ready to enter a new period of their development.

The constitutional changes in England during the fourteenth century were important. In 1322 Edward II. declared that in future all matters pertaining to the kingdom should be

*The  
English  
driven out,  
1454.*

settled by a Parliament, in which should be represented the clergy and barons and the common people. He also abolished certain feudal taxes, and relied on grants of money by the Parliament. In 1341 the commoners were separated from the lords, and met apart for the purpose of deliberation. In 1376 the Parliament claimed and exercised the right to try members of the king's council for embezzlement.

*Constitutional  
changes in  
England*

The fourteenth century was also marked by a movement among the people which showed itself in many ways. In 1348 a plague spread over all Europe, which resulted in the death of perhaps half of the population. Whole districts in England were almost depopulated. This, of course, made the demand for the service of free labourers much greater. The natural effect was that all free workmen demanded larger wages than they had ever before received. The English sense of the binding force of custom and tradition was thereby deeply offended, especially since at the same time the expense of farming was increased. In 1349 both Houses of Parliament met and passed a statute that the same wages should be paid as were customary before the plague, and made it a crime for any one to demand more. The immediate effect of this measure was to increase the bitterness already existing between the classes, but as far as prohibiting the demand for higher wages went, it was without avail. The work must be done, and the peasants refused to do it without an increase in pay. This led the landlords to try to reduce the free labourers to villeinage again. In many cases the villein had secured his freedom by paying a small sum of money to his landlord. Since the service had become so much more valuable, the landlords now declared that the contract into which they had entered was unfair, and they refused to accept the sum of money agreed upon in place of service. This would have solved the difficulty and the landlords would have thereby acquired a sufficient amount of labour to till their estates, but its injustice caused a revolt. Many of Wyclif's preachers

*Social  
movements*

espoused the cause of the peasants, and there arose besides a large number of peasants who went about inciting the people to resistance. There was an uprising all over England. The property of the nobility was attacked, their game and fish preserves destroyed, the records of the villein's dues were burned, and even many people put to death. An army of more than 100,000, led by Wat Tyler, *Wat Tyler's* Jack Straw, and John Ball, marched upon *rebellion.* London, expecting to appeal to the king to support them against the nobility. They got into London and put many to death, among them the lawyers of the new Inn of the Temple and the archbishop of Canterbury, who had proposed many of the obnoxious measures in Parliament. Richard II, still a mere boy, met them and promised to abolish villeinage, whereupon the majority of the peasants returned home. About 30,000 of them, however, were bent on mischief, and could not be dispersed until an army attacked and scattered them. The revolt was followed by severe punishments. The leaders were put to death, as well as many who had taken part in it. All England was united against the insurgents, and the lot of the peasants became harder than ever before.

This peasants' revolt had a bad effect on a movement which had for its author John Wyclif. By an independent study of the Bible he had come to differ radically from the Church in many points. He attacked the authority *Wyclif.* of the pope and the doctrine of transubstantiation, later even the mass. At first he had simply striven against what he called abuses in the Church—the worldly clergy, the heavy ecclesiastical taxes, the sale of indulgences and pardons, pilgrimages, the use of relics, and the worship of saints; but opposition developed his ideas until he broke out into open hostility to the Church in almost everything. He based all his doctrines directly on his interpretation of the Bible. He sent out many preachers to carry his teaching to the people, and they succeeded in gaining many adherents. His sympathies were, for the most part, with the common people, and his cry for reform



was taken up by them. It was due in part to his agitation that the peasants' revolt took place. The violence committed on that occasion frightened the nobility and even the common people, and Wyclif's movement thus fell into disrepute. His preachers, called the Lollards, or idle babblers, were repressed and persecuted. He himself was bitterly opposed by the clergy, but suffered no personal violence, though he was compelled to leave Oxford and retire to his home at Lutterworth, where he spent the last years of his life in revising an earlier translation of the Bible. He was ordered to appear at Rome to defend himself, when death overtook him. Political considerations, the alliance between Henry V. and the papacy, led to the repeated persecutions of his followers, and so his movement came to nothing.

During the last years of his life Henry VI. suffered from frequent attacks of insanity, and these directly caused the civil strife known, from the badges of the opposing factions, as the Wars of the Roses. This was the struggle between the great houses of England, at first for the control of the king, and later for the possession of the crown. The duke of York drove Henry VI. out of England in 1461 and had himself crowned as Edward IV (1461-83). For ten years the contest continued, however. England remained unquiet, for Edward and his chief supporter, Warwick the "Kingmaker," quarrelled. Warwick joined Margaret of Anjou and allied with France. In 1471 Edward overthrew Warwick at Barnet and Margaret at Tewkesbury.

Edward IV, feeling himself secure on the throne, found leisure to begin a war in connection with Charles the Bold of Burgundy against Louis XI of France. He hoped to prevent the extension of French power in the Netherlands, but was unable to do so. His death put his son, Edward V., a boy of twelve years, on the throne. Both Edward V. and his younger brother, the duke of York, were thrust into the Tower by their uncle, Richard, duke of Gloucester, who had been made protector, and the relatives of their mother, who

had been exercising great influence up to this time, were either imprisoned or put to death. Fearing that if the young king were once crowned and acknowledged, his own life would be in danger, Richard, by the most shameless charges against the honour of his own mother, secured the recognition of himself as king. He was crowned as Richard III (1483) *Richard III, 1483-* He met with some opposition, but was able to resist it successfully. He felt, however, that he <sup>85</sup> was not safe so long as the young Edward V. and his brother lived, and they were accordingly put to death in the Tower by Richard's orders. This crime cost him his popularity. The duke of Richmond, another descendant of Edward III., was encouraged to invade England, and in the battle of Bosworth (1485) Richard III was slain, and the duke of Richmond was made king under the title of Henry VII. For nearly thirty years England had suffered so terribly *Henry VII., 1485-1500,* by these civil wars that the people, worn out, were *brings* willing to do anything, or to submit to anything, if *peace* only they might have peace. It was not so much that the great houses were destroyed; it was rather the horror that was everywhere felt for civil war that now opened the way for the Tudor House, of which Henry VII. was the head, to become practically absolute, and rule without regard to constitution or Parliament. The people, feeling that nothing could be worse than civil war, were glad to have a strong king, because they believed that such a ruler alone was able to preserve peace and order.

The Renaissance was just beginning to be felt in England at this time. Richard III. was himself one of its most prominent supporters. Before he saw the way *The Renaissance in England* open to the throne he had been especially active in this direction. It was unfortunate both for him and for the cause of learning that the temptation to seize the crown was put in his way. But even as king he kept alive his interest in the new learning and aided it by his legislation. He passed a law forbidding any hindrance or injury to any one who was engaged in importing or selling books in the kingdom. Learning suddenly became with many a passion; the move-

ment was still in its swaddling-clothes, to be sure, but the foundation was being laid for the glorious achievements of the sixteenth century

To return to France, the last years of Charles VII. were not so fortunate as the first. The victories which Jeanne d'Arc won for him secured him the title of the Victorious. By establishing a standing army he became independent of his vassals for military service. He quarrelled with his son Louis, who thereupon intrigued against him, and made alliances with his enemies. The king also fell under the control of bad ministers. His court was vitiated by the presence of royal mistresses.

Louis XI. (1461-83) was, from the point of view of the kingship, one of the most successful of all the French kings, but he has won the reputation of being the most cruel, crafty, and unprincipled of men. He was a master in the arts of duplicity and deception. His settled policy was the acquisition of territory, and the strengthening of the royal power. Several of the great appanages were added to the royal domain during his reign; two most important acquisitions were made on the eastern frontier as follows: in 1477, at the death of Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, Louis XI. seized his duchy, and in 1481 he got possession of Provence. In this way the eastern boundary of France was much extended. In order to increase the royal prerogative, Louis XI. established provincial *parlements*, thereby dividing and weakening the *Parlement* of Paris, the body that was most able to hinder the growth of the royal power.

Charles VIII (1483-98), the successor of Louis XI., increased the royal possessions by the addition of Brittany (1491), thus practically completing the unification of France. The power of the king was rapidly increasing, while that of the feudal nobility was practically broken. The king was ruler in fact as well as name. With the whole of France in his hands the way was open for Charles VIII to look abroad. His invasion of Italy (1494) marks in French history the beginning of the era of conquest.

## CHAPTER XVI

### GERMANY, 1254-1500, AND THE SMALLER STATES OF EUROPE

#### LITERATURE—As in Chaps III, IV and VII.

- Blok, *History of the People of the Netherlands*  
Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy*  
Lodge, *The Close of the Middle Ages*  
Ashley, James and Philip van Artevelde  
Dyer and Hassall, *History of Modern Europe* (1453-1900)  
Hugandstead, *Switzerland*  
Henderson, *Documents*  
Daendliker, *Short History of Switzerland*  
H. Morse Stephens, *Portugal*  
Hale, *Spain*  
S. Lane-Poole, *Moors in Spain*  
Bucheim, *Wilhelm Tell*  
Clarke, *The Cid*

ANARCHY prevailed in Germany during the great interregnum (1254-73). The great princes made use of the opportunity to seize the crown lands and to make themselves strong at the expense of the weaker nobles. But in spite of the violence of the times, owing to the spirit of self-help which the cities exhibited, as shown in the Rhenish league, industry and commerce increased.

The seven princes who from this time have the sole right to elect the emperor, fearing lest the new emperor would make them disgorge what they had unjustly seized, were in no hurry to end the interregnum. Finally, the pope told them that if they did not elect an emperor, he himself would appoint one. They accordingly chose Rudolf, count of Hapsburg, who they thought would not be strong enough to interfere with them in any way. Rudolf had the good sense to see that he could do nothing in Italy

*The Great  
Interreg-  
num, 1254-  
73*

*Rudolf,  
count of  
Hapsburg,  
Emperor,  
1273-92.*

and very little in Germany, so he wisely exerted himself in trying to strengthen his family by acquiring as much territory as possible. Ottokar, king of Bohemia, resisted him. Rudolf was victorious over him and confiscated his possessions (1278), retaining a large part of them for his own family. In this way the Hapsburgs became possessed of Austria. Vienna was made their residence. After thus looking after the interests of his family, Rudolf turned his attention to the empire, restoring peace, and administering justice with a firm hand.

At the death of Rudolf the electors refused to choose his son, lest the Hapsburgs should become too strong. Adolf of Nassau (1292-98) was elected, but was soon deserted, because he also wished to gain territory at the expense of the empire. The electors deposed him and set up Albrecht I. (1298-1308), the son of Rudolf I. Albrecht I., continuing the policy of his father, made friends with the cities in order to have their aid against the nobles.

Henry VII. of Luxemburg (1308-13) succeeded Albrecht, and by marrying the widowed queen of Bohemia to his son, secured his family in the possession of that kingdom. Forgetting the lessons which his predecessors had learned, Henry VII. allowed himself to be persuaded to go to Italy in the vain hope of re-establishing order there. He received both the Lombard and imperial crowns, but died suddenly near Pisa without accomplishing anything. A disputed election followed. The Luxemburg party made Ludwig of Bavaria emperor, while the Hapsburgs elected one of their own number, Frederick the Fair. A civil war ensued which ended in the victory of the Luxemburgs. Ludwig was the acknowledged emperor, but Frederick was to be his successor, and in the meantime to have the title of king of the Romans. He was also to act as regent in the absence of the emperor. Ludwig then went to Italy, but was able to do nothing toward a settlement of the disturbances in that unfortunate country. He deeply offended the pope by

receiving the imperial crown from a layman, the head of the Roman Commune. A bitter struggle ensued between pope and emperor, in which the claims of both to universal dominion were renewed. The pope declared Ludwig deposed, and claimed the right to act as emperor until another emperor should be elected. In answer to this the electors *Rhense*, met at Rhense (1338), and asserted that they alone <sup>1338</sup> were competent to elect an emperor, nor did their choice need the confirmation of the pope.

Ludwig spent the last years of his life in trying to secure property for his family. This turned the electors against him and involved him in a war with Charles of Bohemia, who was set up as a rival king, a struggle brought to an end only by the death of Ludwig (1347). Charles was everywhere recognized as his successor. As king of Bohemia, Charles IV. *Charles IV.*, deserved well of his country. He acquired much <sup>1346-78</sup> new territory, getting possession of Brandenburg, Silesia, and Moravia. For his capital city, Prague, he had a special fondness. He established the first German university there (1348), and surrounded himself with the best artists of this time (Prague school of painting). In 1356 he published the Golden Bull, by the terms of which the relations of king *The Golden* and electors were settled. Charles made two *Bull*, 1356. journeys into Italy, but succeeded only in getting himself laughed at by the Italians, who had no regard for so insignificant an emperor. He renewed the imperial claim to Burgundy by having himself crowned king of that country. But this was an empty form. Burgundy was already hopelessly broken into independent principalities, eventually to be absorbed by the expanding kingdom of France. *Wenzel*, Charles IV was succeeded by his son Wenzel <sup>1378-1400</sup>. (1378-1400), but he was so incapable that he was deposed.

The fourteenth century witnessed the defence of their liberties by the Swiss. The history of the origin *Origin of* of Switzerland takes us back to the last Hohen- *Switzerland*. staufen. During the reign of Frederick II. the two forest cantons of Uri and Schwyz had acquired letters-

patent from the emperor, by which they were freed from the sovereignty of the counts of Hapsburg, whose territory lay in that part of Germany (southern Suabia). In 1291 representatives from these two cantons met with some men of Unterwalden, where the Hapsburgs still had seigniorial rights, and swore to protect each other as confederates (*Eidgenossen*) against every attack upon their liberties. This is the beginning of the Swiss confederation. These simple, hardy peasants, neat-herds, and foresters, who, in their isolated mountain homes, had preserved much of the old Teutonic vigour, and even many of the old Teutonic institutions, had never been assimilated to the feudal system; and now that it began to irritate them with restrictions on their freedom, they resolved to shake it off. The fact that their feudal lords, the Hapsburgs, had risen to the empire did not frighten them from their resolution. They even ventured upon encroachments of the neighbouring territory. This was more than Hapsburg pride and patience would submit to, and Leopold, brother of Frederick the Fair, invaded their territory with the flower of Austrian chivalry. At Morgarten (1315) the Confederates suddenly fell upon Leopold, and his feudal armament was annihilated by bands of low-born peasants, equipped with axes and pitchforks. It was a spectacle new and surprising to the world, prophetic of the passing of knighthood. Owing to this success of the confederation new adherents gradually poured in, until by the middle of the century, Zurich and Bern having joined their lot to their neighbours', the confederation embraced the so-called eight old cantons (*Orte*). It was repeatedly called upon to defend itself against the Hapsburgs and their feudal allies of Suabia, but with the battle of Sempach (1386), won over another Leopold, it raised itself beyond danger from princely authority. This battle was, in its character of peasant *versus* baron, a repetition of Morgarten, and the touching story of Arnold of Winkelried, who is said to have made the first breach in the ranks of the enemy by gathering to his breast as many spears as he could grasp, truthfully illustrates the style of manhood destined in the new social order to supersede the knight

At the death of emperor Rupert (1400-10) there was a disputed election, but Sigismund was finally recognized as emperor (1410-37). His efforts to reform the Church led to the calling of the council at Constance, which condemned Huss to be burned for his heresy, and ended the schism by deposing the three popes who were struggling for recognition, and electing Martin V. In 1415 Sigismund, in order to pay off his indebtedness to Frederick of Hohenzollern, gave him the mark of Brandenburg. By his wise government Frederick re-established order and made himself master of the territory. The power and possessions of his successors steadily grew, till in 1701 the mark was made into the kingdom of Prussia; in our day the leading power in Germany.

*Rupert,  
1400-10  
Sigismund,  
1410-37.*

*The Hohen-  
zollern  
acquire  
Branden-  
burg, 1415.*

The burning of Huss led to a national revolt in Bohemia. That country was inhabited by Slavs, but there were many Germans there also. There was much opposition between the two races, and when the national hero, Huss, was burned by the German emperor, the opposition to everything German was quickened into the most bitter hostility. In 1419 Sigismund became the lawful king of Bohemia, but the Bohemians refused to acknowledge him. A fierce civil war ensued; the Hussites, as they called themselves, were at first victorious, but when religious and social dissensions arose among them, and when conservative Bohemians became frightened at the radical changes proposed by the fanatical party, they made peace with the emperor and assisted him in restoring order.

*The revolt  
in Bohemia*

The brief reign of Albrecht II. (1438-39), the son-in-law and heir of Sigismund, was important for the Hapsburgs, because he re-acquired for them the imperial crown, and united under his dominion all the territory which has ever since formed the principal part of their possessions. He ruled over the duchy of Austria, Styria, Carniola, Tyrol, Bohemia, and Hungary. His nephew, Frederick III. (1440-93), succeeded

*Albrecht  
II., 1438-39.  
Frederick  
III,  
1440-93.*



him, but his reign presents only a long succession of blunders. He lost Bohemia and Hungary, which were not recovered by the Hapsburgs till 1526

The signal and unmerited good fortune which befell Frederick's house and gave to it new lustre was the acquisition of the greater part of the states of the duke of Burgundy. During the fifteenth century a collateral branch of the House of France had gradually added to its French fief of Burgundy the whole of the Netherlands, and Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy (1467-77), had become one of the foremost rulers of Europe. His ambition looked toward the establishment of a great middle kingdom between France and Germany, independent of either. In this scheme the Swiss proved a stumbling-block. Their territory lay so opportune for his plans that he resolved to subjugate it. But the brave mountaineers beat back his invasion at Granson and Murten (Morat) (1476), and finally his whole splendid army went down before them at Nancy (1477). Charles himself was among the dead. Since there was only a daughter, Mary, to succeed him, Louis XI. of France immediately seized the crown fief, the duchy of Burgundy proper, on the claim that it was vacant, and would have taken more had not Frederick promptly acquired Mary's hand in marriage for his son Maximilian (1477), and thus established a legal claim to the rest. So the territorial expansion of the House of Austria was not checked even under this weak king. A similar chance of a happy matrimonial alliance gave it, a few years later, the vast possessions of Spain (1516), when Maximilian's son, Philip, married Joan, heir of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. Their son, Charles, was the famous emperor Charles V (1519-55), who dreamt of renewing the empire of the west.

Though the Hapsburgs figure from the fifteenth century among the most powerful dynasties of Europe, the empire is nowise profited from their strength. The decay of this institution had continued from the twelfth century, and was destined to continue without

*Permanent  
decay of the  
empire.*

interruption. One by one its cosmopolitan claims had been exploded. It was now only the national government of Germany. But even in Germany we have seen it lose its authority, and, although it tided itself over to the nineteenth century (1806), it was never again anything more than a body without a soul. Germany had lost her central government in all but name. German strength and civilization, as far as they acquired political expression at all in the modern period, are to be sought among the local governments of the princes and the cities.

It is necessary to give, in the briefest manner possible, a bird's-eye view of those parts of Europe which played no great rôle in the Middle Age, but which were, nevertheless, engaged in the slow process of political development.

In the northern part of Spain certain principalities were gradually formed, such as the kingdoms of Leon, Castile, Aragon, Navarre. About 1040 Leon and Castile were united, and a hundred years later Catalonia *Spain.* was absorbed by Aragon. When the Ommiad Khalifate came to an end (1031), five large Mohammedan kingdoms were established (Toledo, Seville, Cordova, Saragossa, and Badajoz), besides several small principalities. There was a constant struggle between these and the small Christian states on the north in which the Christians were increasingly successful. Before the end of the thirteenth century all of Spain, except the south-eastern part, the *Fall of the* principality of Granada, was again in the hands *Moors, 1492.* of the Christians. This remained Mohammedan until 1492, when Ferdinand and Isabella conquered it.

Meanwhile Castile and Aragon, becoming the most powerful states, had gradually absorbed all the others. Sicily and Sardinia were added to Aragon during the last years of the thirteenth century. The consolidation of the two *Union of* leading Spanish states was accomplished (1474) by *Castile and* the marriage of Isabella of Castile to Ferdinand of Aragon. *Aragon.* The unification of Spain was soon after completed, and she was prepared to take her place among the leading states of Europe.

In 1095, when king Alphonso gave the county of Portugal to his son-in-law, Henry of Burgundy, it consisted of only the small territory between the Douro and Minho rivers. In 1139, after a great victory over the Moors, the count was made a king, and from that time the struggle with the Mohammedans for territory went steadily forward. In about one hundred years the kingdom was extended to nearly its present boundaries.

The territory lying about the mouth of the Rhine (Holland and Belgium) was slow in attaining a complete independence and a separate national existence. It was a part of the empire of Karl the Great, and in the division of 843 (Verdun) was given to Lothar. A long strip of territory called Lotharingia, lying west of the Rhine from Basel to the North Sea, came to be divided into two parts, upper and lower. The latter comprised all the territory north of the Moselle river, including, therefore, nearly all of modern Belgium and Holland. Following the feudal tendency, Lotharingia broke up into several fiefs, most of which succeeded in rendering themselves practically free from foreign control. Among these feudal principalities were the counties of Namur, Hainault, Luxemburg, Holland, Geldeiland, and others, the episcopal sees of Liège, Crambrai, and Utrecht; and the duchies of Brabant and Limburg. To the west of these lay the county of Flanders, which, breaking away from the kingdom of France, had become practically independent. The growth and power of the cities in all this territory were remarkable. Their inhabitants became rich, and early took part in the communal revolt. They naturally wished to be free from Germany and France, one or the other of which had sovereign claims over all this land, and hence naturally became the allies of England in the Hundred Years' War. Their progress in civilization was rapid, and during this period they laid the foundation of the strength which they were to develop in the sixteenth century in their tremendous struggle with Spain.

During the last years of the fourteenth century and the

first of the fifteenth the French dukes of Burgundy got possession by marriage and conquest of almost all of these little independent territories after they had seriously weakened themselves by making war on each other. By the marriage of Mary of Burgundy, the daughter of Charles the Bold, with Maximilian of Austria (1477), afterward emperor, the Netherlands came into the possession of the House of Hapsburg.

The conquests and settlements of the Norsemen have already been described. In the ninth and tenth centuries Denmark was united into one kingdom and had a period of considerable power, followed by another of decadence. Sweden also became a kingdom in the ninth and tenth centuries. Christianity was thoroughly established there by about 1050. Norway was not unified until about the year 1000. For some centuries the history of these countries is but a confused succession of wars and civil strife, which was not ended till 1397 by the union of Calmar. Theoretically, this union put the three countries on the same plane. In reality, Denmark was the leading power, and dominated the other two. Sweden made several attempts to revolt and gain her independence, but without success, till the appearance of Gustavus Vasa (1523). Norway, however, remained united to Denmark till 1814.

The victory of emperor Otto I over the Hungarians on the Lech (955) put an end to their invasions of the west. During the tenth century Christianity was introduced among them from Germany and Constantinople. The country suffered terribly under the invasion of the Mongols (from 1241 on), but the devastated regions were re-peopled with Germans. The family of Stephen (the Arpad dynasty) held the throne till 1301, when it became extinct, and the crown went to an Angevin of the French family of Charles of Anjou, who had established himself as king of Sicily and Naples. After the failure of this dynasty (1437) the crown was fought over for nearly one hundred years. The country, gradually weakened by this strife, yielded

to an invasion of the Turks. At the battle of Mohacs (1526) Solyman II destroyed the Hungarian army, and got possession of a large part of the country, which he held for nearly one hundred and fifty years. The rest of Hungary passed into the hands of the Hapsburgs, but, although added to Austria, always enjoyed a measure of independence.

In consequence of the efforts of Otto I. to extend Christianity and, at the same time, German influence to the east, several bishoprics (Merseburg, Zeitz, Meissen, Havelberg, Brandenburg) were established under the archbishop of Magdeburg. Their bishops were the missionaries to the

Slavs. Christianity spread among the Poles, but  
*Poland.*

the process of Germanizing them was checked by the establishment of Gnesen as an archbishopric (1000) directly under the pope. This secured to Poland an independent ecclesiastical development, and also the preservation of its nationality. In the eleventh century Poland consisted of the territory on both sides of the river Warthe. Pomerania was conquered in the next century, and thus Poland acquired a seaboard. By the marriage of a Polish princess with the prince Jagello of Lithuania Poland acquired a new dynasty and all the territory of the Dnieper and Dniester rivers. By some victories over the German Order her boundaries were also extended on the north till her territory reached from the Baltic to the Black Sea. At the end of the Middle Ages Poland seemed a powerful state, possessed of great possibilities. The nobility, however, was omnipotent: the common people were oppressed with too great burdens; and there were certain forces at work which were destined to cause the destruction of the state.

The settlements of the Norsemen at Novgorod and Kiev, and the dynasty established by them, have already been spoken of. These settlements were united about  
*The Norse-*  
*men in*  
*Russia.* 900 A.D., and shortly afterward were Christianized from Constantinople. The Mongols established themselves north of the Black Sea, and compelled all the principalities of Russia to pay tribute. A large part of

Russia continued subject to them till the end of the fifteenth century, when Ivan III threw off their yoke. He also reduced all the independent principalities and, probably to indicate that he regarded himself as the successor of the emperor at Constantinople, took the title of Czar. He laid the foundation for the growth of Russia in the next centuries.

The Greek Empire was engaged in constant struggle with the Mohammedans. The Seljuk Turks, as we have seen, conquered nearly all the imperial possessions in *The Greek Asia*. In spite of the efforts that were made about *Empire*, the time of the crusades to drive them out of Asia Minor, they kept a firm hold upon a part of it. The Ottoman Turks coming from central Asia about the middle of the fourteenth century began a brilliant career of conquest, in which they encroached steadily on the territory of the empire, conquering the Balkan peninsula, and extending their sway far north beyond the Danube. The fall of Constantinople (1453) marks the end of the Byzantine empire. While Mohammedanism was being utterly driven out of Spain, it was firmly establishing itself on the Balkan peninsula, from which vantage ground it was yet to threaten some of the Christian states of Europe.

## CHAPTER XVII

### RELIGIOUS AND INTELLECTUAL TENDENCIES IN THE RENAISSANCE

LITERATURE.—Van Dyke, *Age of the Renaissance*.

Burckhardt, *Civilization of the Renaissance*

Locke, *Age of the Great Western Schism*

Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy* 7 vols

Pastor, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*. 3 vols

Creighton, *History of the Papacy, 1378-1527* 5 vols

Symonds, *Life and Times of Michelangelo* 2 vols

Villari, *Life and Times of Savonarola, and Life and Times of Machiavelli*

Morley, *Machiavelli*

Robinson and Rolfe, *Petrarch*

Field, *Introduction to the Study of the Renaissance*

Loserth, *Hus und Wiclif*. Translated

Clark, *Libraries of the Medieval and Renaissance Periods*

COLLEGE HISTORIES OF ART Van Dyke, *Painting* Hamlin, *Architecture*

Marquand and Frothingham, *Sculpture*.

BIOGRAPHIES OF ARTISTS Biographies of Giotto, Titian, Fra Angelico, de Sario, da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, etc.

ART HANDBOOKS Edited by E J Poynter 9 vols dealing with Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture

THE period which we have been studying, erroneously called the Dark Ages, had a civilization peculiarly its own. Politically, the age was dominated by the idea of the world-empire, until the thirteenth century saw the destruction of the empire and the rise of nationalities and states. Ecclesiastically, it was ruled by the idea of the world-Church, with the pope at its head. Intellectually, the period may be gauged by the fact that the Germans, a vigorous, primitive people, were slowly learning, adopting, and adapting the Roman civilization preserved and taught them by the Church. Of all the institutions in the Middle Age the Church, because she held the position of both priest

*Characteristic Ideas of the Middle Age.*

and teacher of the young barbarian world, was by far the most powerful.

The Middle Age presents many phenomena which indicate that the mind of man was not idle. The schools of Karl the Great, and the Universities which appear about the twelfth century; the Latin literature, chronicles, biographies, histories, controversial and doctrinal writings; the two opposing systems of philosophy.

*The Middle Age was productive in many fields*

nominalism and realism, each of which was represented by men who have left us many works attesting the keenness and power of their intellects; the many treatises on theological questions; the religious writings of such men as Bernard of Clairvaux, Eckhart, and Thomas à Kempis, whose imitable "Imitation of Christ" is still a classic with men mystically inclined; the organized life of the nobility, as seen in chivalry, with its ideal of Christian knighthood, and its literature of religion, love, war, and adventure; the minstrels, in the north of France\* the trouvères, in the south the troubadours, in Germany the minnesingers; the lyric poetry, and especially the great national or religious epics, such as the Song of Roland, the Nibelungen Lied, the Tales of King Arthur and the Round Table, the Canterbury Tales of Chaucer, the Tales about Karl the Great, and Alexander the Great, and the Holy Grail, and the Divine Comedy of Dante; the two great styles of architecture, the Romanesque (to 1150) and the Gothic (1125-1500), with their magnificent churches, cathedrals, city halls, and palaces, the decorative arts, wood-carving, glass and panel-painting, sculpture, miniature painting and illuminating; the religious painting whose greatest representative is Giotto! the new life in the cities, the growth of commerce, the rise of the people to wealth and political independence, their activity in building, in the practice of the fine as well as the industrial arts, in literature, such as the fables, miracle-plays and master-songs—what more is necessary to show that the Middle Age was full of mental vigour and activity, much of which may still command our interest and admiration?

1 The Renaissance in its broadest signification is the name



given to the civilization which gradually displaced in the minds of men the medieval conceptions of the state, of society, of nature, of art, and of philosophy. It was a revolution under the dominant influence of the Roman-Greek world, which, after a thousand years of oblivion, was again brought to light and life. The world had outgrown the narrow ideals of the Middle Age, and when the ancient world was revealed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by its art and literary treasures, there was a spontaneous movement toward the freer life which had been the charm of classic times. But since the people could not wholly get away from their past immediately the Renaissance is, naturally, characterized by the fusion of the classical with the medieval.

The Renaissance had its origin and reached its highest development in Italy, and was from there carried to all the other countries of Europe. In Italy the conditions favourable to such a movement were far more numerous than anywhere else. Italy had more of the Roman civilization. Rome was there with her monuments and with all her wealth of tradition. Though the wear and tear of daily use had greatly modified the Latin tongue and it was rapidly becoming Italian, it nevertheless was effective in preserving and transmitting to the people of Italy the accumulated culture of Rome. In Italy the power of the Empire was weakest, and consequently the feudal system never took vigorous root there. The cities of Italy were the first to become independent. Their situation, with all its opportunities, seemed to act as an intellectual ferment, and for a while they led the world in civilization.

Now this movement in civilisation, which is called the Renaissance and which began in Italy, is a very complicated matter. It is important to understand that the Renaissance affected man in all his ideas and relations of life; that it altered his status in the family and in society; that it revolutionized his views of the state; that it aroused in him, by enlarging his mental outlook, the passion of knowledge; that it endowed

mountain for the mere delight of the journey and to enjoy the view from the summit. In 1335 he made the ascent of Mount Ventoux in France. It is evident that the emancipation of man from the medieval thralldom had well begun, and love of nature and appreciation of her beauty, once awakened, steadily increased.

The Renaissance was further characterized by a great growth in individualism. Hero worship flourished probably as never before, and men were consumed with the passion to become famous. To know all that could be known, to do all that could be done, to excel in every field of human endeavour, to make of one's self the most striking and original personality possible, became a common desire. Brunellesco, Michel Angelo, and Da Vinci, each equally famous in several fields of activity and learning, were not isolated examples of the many-sided or perfect man (*uomo universale*) who was the ideal of the age.

*The Renaissance fosters individualism.*

In the Middle Age the feudal castle was the scene of all the social life of the time. But with the rise of the cities, and the overthrow of feudalism came the new urban social life. Life in the cities begot new forms of social intercourse, such as receptions, parties, balls, and the numerous other kinds of social entertainment and intercourse with which we are still familiar. In the Renaissance society became a fine art.

*The Renaissance produces a new social life.*

In the light of the above-mentioned changes it would not seem strange if we should find a corresponding change in the moral and religious practice and belief of the time. The Renaissance brought with it, in fact, a great disregard of the Church, her claims, and her teachings. Many took the greatest delight in lampooning the Church and the clergy. Breaking away from her control and losing, apparently, all conception of right and wrong, they exhibited in their lives the most hideous vices and revelled in crime and wickedness. This was the classic period of Italian horrors. For a while it was hoped that the humanists would bring about a reform of the Church.

*The Renaissance works a change in morals and religion.*

Erasmus, the greatest scholar of his time, based his hopes on the new learning and its representatives, but it soon became apparent that the humanists lacked the moral earnestness necessary for such a work

The Renaissance, although beginning in Italy, soon spread to the rest of Europe and everywhere showed the same vices and the same virtues as in its first home. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Germany, France, and England were under the influence of the spirit of the Renaissance. In Germany one group of humanists was clever and frivolous, while the other was serious and busied itself with the problems of educational and religious reforms. The court of Francis I. (1515-47) bore the stamp of the Renaissance, and in the French cities there were groups of earnest men and able scholars who drew their inspiration from the new learning. Richard III. of England, whom we abhor for his crimes, was a typical prince of the Renaissance, practising the teachings of Machiavelli. Through the teachings of Colet, Grocyn, Linacre, More, and Erasmus, Oxford became the centre of the movement in England. Shakespeare may be regarded as its culmination.

The Renaissance, being essentially an age of revolt, accounts in part for the increasing dissatisfaction with the Church and the growing opposition to the papacy. But to understand the condition in which the papacy now found itself, it is necessary briefly to recount its history since the end of its struggle with the Hohenstaufen. The papacy, although victorious in its struggle with the empire, soon found itself in a worse plight than ever before. The empire was indeed no longer a menace to the independence of the

Nationalism opposes the universal claims of the papacy. papacy, but other and stronger foes had appeared to take its place. There were the other countries of Europe with a rising sense of nationality, jealous of their independence, and ever ready to resist the authority of the pope and to resent what seemed to them his interference in their affairs. These national differences were felt even in the college of cardinals,

and it was difficult to secure a harmonious papal election. France was now the leading power of Europe, and her king was bent on using the pope for his own ends. To render the situation more intolerable to the pope, the people of Rome aspired to independence, and frequently refused to permit the pope to dwell in Rome. Innocent IV. (1243-54) spent very little of his pontificate in the city; Alexander IV. (1254-61) was never there; Clement IV. (1265-68) lived in Perugia. Neither was the pope master in the rest of Italy. The larger cities, such as Florence, Venice, and Genoa, were the independent possessors of much territory. The French held southern Italy, the Germans part of northern Italy. Through the uprising of the Sicilians against the French, known as the Sicilian Vespers (1282), Peter III. of Aragon gained possession of the island, thus increasing the number of the political opponents of the pope.

*Rome hostile to the popes.*

*The powers in Italy oppose the papacy.*

In 1294 Benedictus Cajetanus of Anagni was made pope, with the title of Boniface VIII. (1294-1303). His pontificate marked the highest pretensions, and, at the same time, proved the impotence of the papacy. In 1294-1295 the famous bull, "Clericis Laicos," on pain of excommunication, he forbade all laymen to collect taxes on Church lands, and all clergymen to pay them. Since the Church was very rich in lands, if this bull had been enforced the income of the State would have been greatly diminished. Philip IV. of France, therefore, retaliated by forbidding any money to be taken out of France into Italy, thus cutting off the pope's income. Boniface now yielded and tried to make peace with Philip; he said the bull was not to be enforced in France, and even granted Philip the tithe from the French clergy for three years. But the quarrel soon broke out again. Philip was determined to humiliate the pope and to show his own mastery. He received at his court two members of the Colonna family, whom Boniface had exiled from Rome, and

*Boniface*

*VIII., 1294-*

*1303-*

*excommunication,*

*he forbade all laymen to collect taxes on Church lands, and all clergymen to pay them.*

*Since the Church was very rich in lands, if this bull had been enforced the income of the State would have been greatly diminished.*

*Philip IV. of France, therefore, retaliated by forbidding any money to be taken out of France into Italy, thus cutting off the pope's income.*

*Boniface now yielded and tried to make peace with Philip; he said the bull was not to be enforced in France, and even granted Philip the tithe from the French clergy for three years.*

*But the quarrel soon broke out again. Philip was determined to humiliate the pope and to show his own mastery.*

*He received at his court two members of the Colonna family, whom Boniface had exiled from Rome, and*

also seized and imprisoned the papal legate. Angered by this, Boniface sent forth one decree after another against Philip. A bull, "Unam Sanctam," was issued, which declared that the pope was intrusted with both the spiritual and temporal power, and that whoever resisted him was resisting the ordinance of God. Submission in temporal matters to the pope was declared to be necessary for salvation. At the same time Boniface threatened to depose Philip and put him under the ban if he would not yield. Philip, in another meeting of his council, preferred a large number of charges against Boniface, and called for a general council to settle the matter. Boniface then published the ban and edict of deposition, only to be besieged in Anagni a month later by the king's ambassador, William of Nogaret, and the Colonna family. He was personally maltreated, but set free a few days later, dying, however, the next month, probably from chagrin and anger caused by the indignities which had been heaped upon him.

It was Boniface VIII. who celebrated the jubilee in 1300, an event which stirred the minds and imaginations of the people at that time most deeply. During this *The Jubilee of 1300.* celebration Boniface, it is said, gave expression to his claims by seating himself on the imperial throne, "arrayed with sword and crown and sceptre, shouting aloud, 'I am Cæsar! I am Emperor!'"

His successor, Benedict II. (1303-4), was hard pressed by Philip IV., and at last withdrew all the demands of Boniface so far as France was concerned. For nearly a year after his death the cardinals could not agree on a candidate, but at length, through the intrigues of the French king, the *Supremacy of France in Europe.* French party in the college elected the bishop of Bordeaux, who had already made a secret compact with Philip IV. He chose the name of Clement V *Clement V at Avignon.* (1304-14). In 1309, at the desire of Philip, he moved the whole Curia to Avignon. Rome was no longer safe for him, the noble families of the city being constantly engaged in street brawls, and since the German emperors had

lost their power there was no one to preserve order. The removal of the papacy to Avignon was a great misfortune, because it brought the pope more completely under the control of the French king. Philip found many subtle and effective ways of bringing pressure to bear on Clement V., so that the unfortunate pope was compelled, against his will, to give aid to the king in his destruction of the order of Knights Templars.

His successor, John XXII, spent most of his time in a bitter struggle with Ludwig of Bavaria (1314-47) about the imperial crown and Italy. This struggle is marked by the appearance of a new theory of the state, promulgated by one branch of the Franciscans. They advanced the idea that the people are sovereign. "Church" meant the whole body of Christian believers, not, as the Roman Catholic Church said, the clergy alone. Even the laymen are all *viri ecclesiastici*; that is, they have a part in the government of the Church. The highest authority is vested in a General Council. The papacy is not apostolic in its origin, but dates from the time of Constantine. The pope, therefore, has no authority over kings, and the state is independent of him. These Franciscans, while proclaiming this heresy, were protected by Ludwig and assisted him in his struggle. Other writers, however, continued to develop a definite theory of the supremacy of the pope.

During the residence of the popes at Avignon the finances of the papacy were systematized and everything was done to insure the collection of vast sums of money. This period of the residence of the popes in Avignon is generally called by Church historians the Babylonish Exile of the papacy.

In 1378 the papal Schism began. Gregory XI. had finally, in 1377, moved the Curia back to Rome, but died the next year. Urban VI. (1378-89), who was elected *The great Schism.* in Rome, alienated by his harsh manner those cardinals who were under the influence of the French king; they consequently revolted from him, declared his election void, and elected Clement VII. (1378-94). Clement soon with-

drew to Avignon and continued the papal line there, while Urban VI. remained in Rome. There were now two men professing to be pope. Germany, England, Denmark, Sweden, and Poland declared for Urban, France, Naples, Savoy, Scotland, Lorraine, Castile, and Aragon were true to Clement VII. For about thirty years there were two lines of popes, and the religious world did not know which one to obey. The schism gave rise to the severest criticism of the papacy, and gave such men as Wycliff and Huss a good opportunity to set forth doctrines at variance with those of the Church.

Since neither pope would yield, and it seemed impossible to end the Schism in any other way, the idea of calling a *The Conciliar Idea.* universal Council was broached. It was declared that in the early days of the Church a Council had been the highest authority. This position of authority had been usurped by the popes. Now let the Council be called, and, since it was competent to do so, let it say who was rightfully pope. After long discussion the cardinals called a Council to meet at Pisa (1409). This Council deposed the two popes, and elected Alexander V., but as the deposed popes refused to acknowledge the authority of the Council, there were now three popes, and the Schism was made worse. Although Alexander V. had promised not to dismiss the Council until the papacy had been reformed, and its finances regulated, he soon prorogued it because sufficient preparations had not been made to proceed with the reform.

From this theory of the power of the Council over the pope this period has been called the conciliar epoch. It produced two more Councils, that of Constance and that of Basel. *Constance,* In Constance (1414) the question of the Schism 1414 was again taken up. Every cardinal swore once more that, if elected, he would reform the Church before dismissing the Council. In 1417 Martin V. was elected, after the three other popes had been deposed. The Council was then ready to proceed with the reform, but those who were most dissatisfied and loudest in their demand for a reform were

not agreed as to what changes should be made. Taking advantage of this, the pope soon dissolved the meeting.

The Council of Basel (1431-49) served only to reveal the weakness of the reform party, since it could accomplish nothing. So from the time of Eugene IV. *The Council (1431-47)* a new period may be said to have begun for the papacy. The conciliar idea lost its power; the popes were drawn into the political struggles of Italy, and were also imbued with the spirit of the Renaissance. *The popes as temporal rulers.* During this time they present the aspect of temporal rulers. They lived in great magnificence, kept standing armies, made war on their enemies, and played an important rôle in the politics and diplomacy of Europe as well as of Italy.

Many pious souls were shocked at such activity on the part of the Vicar of Christ, and complained that while the popes were entangled in the affairs of this world they were neglecting their religious duties. Hostility to the popes as temporal princes begot opposition and a spirit of resistance to their religious authority, and also led to a demand for a reform of the papacy.

As Renaissance princes the popes became prominent patrons of the arts and of learning. *Nicholas V.* *Nicholas V.* (1447-55), known as the first of the Renaissance popes, was an extensive builder and an active patron of learning. His large collection of manuscripts served as the beginning of the *Vatican library.* *The Vatican library.* He made himself master of the city by sternly putting down the last uprising of the seditious populace (1453). *Alexander VI* (1492-1503), worthy scion of the family of the Borgia, and *Julius II.* (1503-13), because of their constant struggles were called war popes. *Alexander VI., and Julius II., the war popes.* *Leo X.* (1513-22) made Rome the centre of the artistic and literary life, and his pontificate was made glorious by coinciding with the culmination of the Renaissance. *Leo X. and the arts.* His patronage of Raphael would alone have secured his fame. To support their court with its immense number of



secretaries, clerks, attendants, and servants, to maintain their troops, to pay for the huge buildings which they erected and for the paintings, statues, and other works of art in which they delighted, to buy manuscripts and books, to support the army of literary men who were in their service, to meet the expenses of their government, which had relations with all the governments of Europe, there was need of enormous sums of money every year. The popes put the world under contribution levying taxes of various kinds and under different names, so that gold flowed in streams from all lands toward Rome. This became another ground for complaint. The Germans, the French, and the English began to ask why they should be taxed to support the pope in luxury, to keep his armies in the field, and to pay for his works of art

There was, therefore, at the end of the fifteenth century, a widespread and profound dissatisfaction with the papacy.

Here there was one ground of discontent, there another. Many voices from all quarters filled the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with calls for reform. To the observant there were many signs portending the great rebellion, ecclesiastical and national, which was to usher in a new era.

*The expenses of the papal court*

*Dissatisfaction portends revolt*





## LITERATURE ON THE MODERN PERIOD

- Lavisse et Rambaud : *Histoire Générale du IV<sup>me</sup> Siècle à nos Jours*.  
Creighton : *History of the Papacy during the Reformation*.  
Ranke : *History of the Popes*.  
Lodge : *History of Modern Europe*.  
Dyer and Hassall : *History of Modern Europe, from 1453-1900*.

### PERIODS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY—

- Johnson : *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*.  
Wakeman : *The Ascendancy of France*.  
Hassall : *The Balance of Power*.  
H. Morse Stephens : *Revolutionary Europe*.  
Phillips : *Modern Europe, 1815-1900*.

### CAMBRIDGE HISTORICAL SERIES—

- Grant : *The French Monarchy, 1483-1789*.  
Martin Hume : *Spain, 1479-1888*.  
Rose : *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era, and A Century of European History, 1789-1888*.  
Stillman : *The Union of Italy*.  
Headlam : *The Foundation of the German Empire*.

### EPOCHS OF MODERN HISTORY—

- Gardiner : *The Thirty Years' War, and the Puritan Revolution*.  
Morris : *The Age of Anne*.  
B. Gardiner : *The French Revolution*.  
M'Carthy : *Epoch of Reform*.

### HEROES OF THE NATIONS—

- Willert : *Henry IV*. Fletcher : *Gustavus Adolphus*. Perkins :  
*Richelieu*. Hassall : *Louis XIV*. Nisbet Bun : *Charles XII*.  
Morris : *Napoleon*.

## 254 LITERATURE ON THE MODERN PERIOD

### FOREIGN STATESMEN SERIES—

Martin Hume *Philip II.* Lodge *Richelieu* Hassall *Mazarin*.  
Bright *Maria Theresa* and *Joseph II.* Willert *Mirabeau*.

### CHURCH HISTORY—

Ward : *The Counter Reformation*.  
Wakeman . *The Church and the Puritans*.

### ENGLISH HISTORY—

Gardiner, Powell and Tout, Ransome, Hassall, Bright (General) Powers,  
Wakeling, Hassall (*Oxford Manuals of English History*) *The*  
*Dictionary of National Biography* *The Dictionary of English*  
*History*.

### BIOGRAPHIES—

Gardner : *Henry VII.* Creighton *Wolsey*. Beesly *Elizabeth*  
Traill *William III.* Hassall *Bolingbroke*. Morley *Walpole*.  
Rosebery *Pitt*. Morley : *Burke*. Wakeman . *Charles James Fox*.  
Thursfield *Peel*

### ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY—

Hallam . *History of England*  
G. W. Prothero : *Introduction and Constitutional Documents* (1559–  
1625).  
Anson . *Law and Customs of the Constitution*.  
Taswell Langmead . *Constitutional History of England*.  
Medley *English Constitutional History*

### FOR DATES AND CHRONOLOGY—

Ploetz . *Epitome of Ancient, Medieval, and Modern History*.  
Nichol . *Tables of European History, Literature, and Art*, 200–1888.  
Hassall : *Handbook of European History*, 476–1871.  
George *Genealogical Tables*.  
H. Morse Stephens : *Modern European History*.

### FOR COLONIES AND COLONIZATION—

Seeley : *The Expansion of England and Growth of England's Foreign*  
*Policy*.  
Lucas : *Historical Geography of the British Isles*.  
Parkman : *Pioneers of France in the New World*.  
Bonassieux : *Les Grandes Compagnies de Commerce*.  
Channing *The United States of America*, 1765–1865.  
Jenks *The Australasian Colonies*.

FOR COLONIES AND COLONIZATION—*continued.*

- Johnston: *A History of the Colonization of Africa by Asiatic and European Nations*  
 Mahan: *Influence of Sea Power upon History.*  
 Colton and Payne: *Colonies and Dependencies.*  
 Keene: *The Fall of the Moghul Empire.*  
 Lyall: *British Dominion in India.*  
 Caldicott: *English Colonization and Empire.*

FOR MAPS—

- Droysen. *Historischer Handatlas, and Allgemeiner Historischer Handatlas.*  
 Perthes: *Pocket Atlas of Medieval and Modern Europe.*  
 Roggero: *Carte Geografiche in Rilievo.* (Relief maps of many European countries).  
 Gardiner: *A School Atlas of English History.*  
 Poole: *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe, from the Decline of the Roman Empire.*  
 Stieler. *Handatlas.*  
 Colbeck: *The Public School Historical Atlas.*  
 M'Clure: *Historical Church Atlas.*  
 Spruner: *Historisch-geographischer Handatlas.*

FOR BIBLIOGRAPHY—

- Allen. *History Topics.* Contains lists of reference books.  
 Adams: *Manual of Historical Literature*  
 Gross: *The Sources and Literature of English History to 1485.*  
 Monod: *Bibliographie de Histoire de France.*  
 Dahlman-Warty. *Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte.*  
 Gardiner and Mullinger *Introduction to English History.*



# THE MODERN PERIOD

---

## INTRODUCTION

THE task before us in this new division of our work is to follow the development of Europe through the Modern Period. The Modern Period is, like the Medieval Period, no sharply defined section of history, with a fixed beginning and a fixed end, but a division serving to denote, in a general way, the prevalence of certain tendencies in the life of man. It was during the Transition Period of the Renaissance (1300-1500) that the distinctively modern tendencies became rooted in civilization, and it is by the end of the Renaissance, and, therefore, at approximately the year 1500, that we may fix the beginning of the Modern Period.

*The Modern  
Period be-  
gins approx-  
imately, with  
the year  
1500*

Now, before we take up the study of Europe in the Modern Period, let us rapidly draw together the threads of the story which we have thus far followed. This can be best done under three heads:

*The pre-  
liminary  
inventory*

A. The leading factors of the civilization of the Renaissance.

B. The voyages of discovery.

C. The European states at the beginning of the Modern Period.

The ordering of our facts under three heads ought to provide us with a convenient inventory of the European situation at the beginning of our period.



#### A. THE LEADING FACTORS OF THE CIVILIZATION OF THE RENAISSANCE

It was during the Renaissance that civilization lost its distinctive medieval forms and acquired those characteristics which we call modern. The leading agencies in this process are once more rapidly enumerated

(1) *The Revival of Learning* —First in Italy, and later in the countries of the north, men began to get interested in the long-forgotten literature and art of Greece and Rome. By patient labour they excavated, as it were, the buried culture of antiquity, and added it to their meagre medieval stock. Thus the medieval man became gradually better equipped to do man's work in the world, and soon engaged in intellectual investigations of which he had been formerly either incapable or afraid. Learning had been confined to things appertaining to religion, it was now extended to all things appertaining to man.

(2) *The Revival of Industry and Commerce* —A remarkable feature of the later medieval centuries was the growth of the cities. They developed a flourishing industry and commerce, and, sheltered by their walls from the depredations of the country barons, became so many hearths in plain and valley of political order and material well-being. We have seen how the Crusades were instrumental in extending the range of western trade and manufacture, and we have seen how in consequence of them the Mediterranean became the great highway of international traffic. Although Venice and Genoa and the other Italian cities were the first to draw an advantage from this situation, the northern cities on the English Channel and the North and Baltic Seas felt ere long the new commercial stimulus. The nations of Europe were thus being continually drawn more closely together, and were mutually profiting from this closeness, when, during the Renaissance, a number of hardy seamen opened up by their voyages of discovery new commercial prospects of a brilliance far beyond anything the

Mediterranean had known. The voyages of discovery must be reckoned in their effects among the most far-reaching of the events which usher in the Modern Age, and are, in fact, so important that we reserve them for special treatment later on.

(3) *The Inventions.*—The introduction of gunpowder (fourteenth century) altered entirely the conditions of war. The superiority of the mounted Knight over the foot-soldier was thereby destroyed. Thus, through its loss of importance in the military field to which, during the Middle Age, it owed its political pre-eminence, the feudal order of nobles received an irreparable injury. A standing army of mercenaries was found by a ruler to be both more serviceable and more reliable than a self-willed aristocracy. The king in consequence began to emancipate himself from the control of his nobles. The invention of printing,<sup>1</sup> by multiplying books, made culture accessible to the many, and ideas, hitherto the privilege of the priest and noble, began to throw their light into the dark and brutal lives of the lower orders.

(4) *The Growth of Absolutism.*—The social changes consequent upon the decay of the nobles and the growth of the cities involved also a political revolution. If in the Middle Age the nobles had been the dominant political factor, it was, first, because they formed the army, and, secondly, because the one great source of wealth in that period, the land, was in their possession. In the Modern Period, owing to the invention of gunpowder, they were no longer necessary for the army, and land, owing to the growth of the cities, fell from its position of sole source of wealth. The king and the cities, who had a common enemy in the nobility, soon found themselves strong enough to unseat their rival from his place of power. Gradually the king began to absorb the political powers of the nobility. Thus the feudal state, in which the power was distributed among the members of an aristocracy, decayed, and in its place arose the absolute monarchy, with the power concentrated in one man.

<sup>1</sup> Ascribed to John Gutenberg of Mainz, 1450.

## B THE VOYAGES OF DISCOVERY AND THE EUROPEAN COLONIZATION OF THE NEW WORLD

The voyages of discovery were natural consequences of the expansion of commerce which followed in the wake of the Crusades. The trade with the Levant, which had rapidly made Genoa and Venice rich, naturally aroused the cupidity of their neighbours, and in the fifteenth century the Spaniards and Portuguese undertook to find a highway to the east other than the Mediterranean. Their endeavours in this enterprise led to all the subsequent discoveries. The heroes of this chapter of human progress are therefore generally Spaniards and Portuguese, or Italians in the service of these nations. The Portuguese travellers were mainly governed by the idea of finding a sea-passage to India<sup>1</sup> by sailing around Africa, they pushed eastward. The Spanish mariners sought to discover a sea-passage to India by circumnavigating the globe, they pushed westward. Each of these series of undertakings was accompanied by marvellous successes, and each had a unique climax.

The Portuguese were the first people to take up the work of discovery systematically, and among them it was Vasco da Gama and India Navigator<sup>2</sup> (1394-1460), who holds the honour of having set the nation upon this path. Passionately fond of nautical matters, he voluntarily exiled himself from the court and took up his residence on a promontory of Cape Vincent, directing from that vantage-point the voyages of his seamen. But he was inspired also by other motives, for he had not only a deep-seated love of knowledge, but also a patriotic desire to win a new empire for his nation and the fervent hope of spreading the Christian faith among the heathen. Gradually

<sup>1</sup> India, in the fifteenth century, was a collective name for the whole Orient.

<sup>2</sup> Consult Beazley Prince Henry.

his mariners pushed down the west coast of Africa. Although the magnetic needle was known to them, they did not well understand the use of it, and, fearful of the unknown, crept along at snail's pace. Before even the equator was crossed (1484) Prince Henry had died. In 1486, Bartholomew Diaz at last reached the Cape of Good Hope, but it was not until 1498 that this advantage was followed up by a journey round the Cape to India. The hero of this momentous voyage, which established a connection with the Orient far more convenient and commercially profitable than any Venice commanded, was Vasco da Gama.

Just before Vasco da Gama had thus set the crown on the Portuguese endeavours of a century, Christopher Columbus<sup>1</sup> had succeeded in a discovery even more important. In the year 1492, while seeking a westward passage to India, he reached the Bahamas and West Indies, and thus first demonstrated to the world the existence of land beyond the Atlantic. Columbus was by birth an Italian of the city of Genoa, but he made his voyage in the employment of Isabella the queen of Castile, and therefore the profits of it fell to Spain<sup>2</sup>. It should be noted that the journey would never have been undertaken by Columbus, if the contemporary scholars, abandoning the ignorant notions of the Middle Age, had not returned to the classical conception that the world was round. But the brilliancy of Columbus's achievement is in no respect dimmed by this circumstance,

<sup>1</sup> Consult, on Columbus, Fiske *Discovery of America*

<sup>2</sup> It is highly probable that the Norsemen discovered America before Columbus. But their discovery was without result. Columbus sailed on his voyage August 3, 1492, from Palos, with three small ships—the Santa Maria, the Pinta, and the Nina. He landed on San Salvador (Guanahani) October 12. Cuba and Hayti were also discovered upon this voyage. Upon his return his sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella, loaded him with honours (hereditary nobility, admiralty, etc.). He followed up his first voyage with three more voyages; second voyage (1493-96), on which he discovered Jamaica; third voyage (1498-1500), on which he first touched upon the continent of South America at the mouth of the Orinoco. It was from this voyage that he, the great benefactor of Spain, was brought back to Spain in chains. On his fourth voyage (1502-4) he landed on the coast of Honduras. He died 1506, near Valladolid, believing to the last that he had reached India.

for the patience, energy, and enthusiasm that made the voyage possible were unexampled and were all his own

In consequence of these triumphs discovery became a passion, especially among the Spaniards and the Portuguese.

*The fever of discovery  
Magellan.* Where fame and wealth so amply rewarded the successful, every adventurer's soul felt a personal summons to strike out into the new and unknown

realms. No period of history is so astir with action and enterprise, so illumined by the purple light of romance. Of course every voyage added to the store of the world's knowledge, but of all the later expeditions, the one which, by virtue of its boldness and its results, may claim a place beside those of Columbus and Vasco da Gama, is the famous first circumnavigation of the globe. This remarkable triumph was achieved by a Portuguese in the Spanish service, Magellan,<sup>1</sup> after a succession of incredible hardships lasting three years (1519-1522).

One of the most notable facts in connection with the voyages of discovery was that the Europeans were not satisfied with a mere acquaintance with the new countries or with opening up new markets for the home traders; they also resolved to Christianize, govern, and colonize their discoveries, in a word, they resolved to re-fashion them as a larger Europe. Naturally the zeal for colonial expansion, which almost immediately rose to extravagant proportions, led to shameless land-grabbing, and soon to quarrels among the rival nations. Spain and Portugal, the leaders in the movement, were the first to become involved in difficulties with one another, and their disputes brought about a famous intervention by pope Alexander VI. (Borgia). In the fifteenth century the pope, as Christ's Vicar, was still regarded as a peacemaker, the best arbiter of quarrels arising among the Christian flock. Upon being appealed to by Spain and Portugal for a settlement of their rival claims, he drew (1493) a line of demarcation, first one hundred leagues, and

<sup>1</sup> Magellan did not himself complete the voyage. He was killed on one of the Philippine Islands, 1521.

later three hundred and seventy leagues west of the Cape Verde islands, and gave all the land to be discovered east of this line to Portugal, all west of it to Spain. This line of demarcation, which cut through the eastern part of South America, gave Spain a claim to the whole of the New World with the exception of what is now Brazil.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the chief centres of Spanish colonization were (1) The West India group, whither Columbus himself had first directed the stream of emigration, (2) Mexico, which was won for the Spaniards by the great conqueror, Cortez; and (3) Peru, which was acquired by Pizarro. The plain facts of these two last-named conquests constitute an unequalled romance in which courage, religious enthusiasm, cruelty, and lust of gold contend with each other for supremacy.

The Portuguese travellers, who followed in the wake of Vasco da Gama, soon undertook, after the fashion of Spain, to bind to the home country by means of colonies the countries which they had discovered in the Indian Ocean. The chain of colonies, which they had been engaged for some time in establishing along the west coast of Africa, was gradually extended to the East Indian Archipelago, to India proper, and Further India. The Portuguese, who were not a numerous people, never succeeded in settling these countries with their own race in such force as to supplant the native element. They themselves understood this difficulty before long, and thereafter were satisfied with merely occupying advance-posts here and there, and with trying to secure by treatise exclusive trade-privileges with the peoples among whom they settled. With Brazil, their one possession in the western world, the case was different. This country they succeeded in winning for their nation, and it has remained Portuguese in tongue and manners to this day.

The northern European countries entered late, and with only gradually increasing fervour, into the contest for the possession of the new continents. The little which Henry VII. of

England did to secure for his country a share in the great extension of the world is of importance only by reason of consequence which he did not remotely foresee. In 1497, Henry, *The English* jealous of Portugal and Spain, at last equipped and *voyages.* sent westward one John Cabot, who was, like Columbus, a Genoese by birth. Cabot's purpose, as well as that of many English mariners after him, was to discover still another passage, a passage by the waters of the north-west, to the oriental fairyland, India, and by this means to elude the Spaniards, who were pushing for this same India by following a south-westerly course. The attempts of Cabot were destined to failure, but England by means of them secured at least a vague claim to the north-eastern coast of America. This claim, after being allowed to lie forgotten for a period, was revived during the reign of Elizabeth, and led, in the progress of time, to the foundation of English colonies of North America.

The French were even more lax than the English in the matter of colonization, and it was not until the reign of Henry *The French* IV (1589-1610) that they remembered that an *colonies* empire was being divided without consideration of themselves. They then hastened to undo as far as possible the consequence of their neglect by settlements in Canada, and, later, in Louisiana—that is, in the St Lawrence and Mississippi basins.

The Dutch owed their colonies to the long war of independence which they waged with the king of Spain. In 1580 *The Dutch* Portugal, as will be seen hereafter, was temporarily *colonies.* incorporated with Spain, the Portuguese colonies, in consequence of this act, becoming Spanish. The Dutch thereupon began to take away from the king of Spain both the Portuguese and the Spanish East-India trade and territory. This fact explains why the centre of the Dutch trade and colonial territory lies to this day in the Indian Ocean.

C. THE EUROPEAN STATES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE  
MODERN PERIOD

*The Empire*

At the opening of the Modern Period Maximilian I. (1493-1519), of the House of Hapsburg, was the head of the Holy Roman Empire, which, once universal, had been practically reduced to the territory of Germany. *The constitution of Germany* The family of Hapsburg had grown so powerful in the fifteenth century that the German crown had almost become its hereditary possession. Theoretically, however, the crown was still elective. On the death of an emperor, a successor could be legally chosen only by the seven electors, who were the seven greatest princes of the realm.<sup>1</sup> The seven electors, the lesser princes (including the higher ecclesiastical dignitaries, such as bishops and abbots), and the free cities, ranged in three separate houses, composed the imperial Diet. The Diet was the legislative body of the Empire, without the consent of which the emperor could not perform any important act. Emperor and Diet together constituted the imperial government, if machinery as decrepit as the machinery of the empire had come to be, may be qualified by that name. In fact, the national government of Germany was little more than a glorious memory. Germany had not, like France, England, and Spain, advanced steadily in the later Middle Age toward national unity, but had steadily travelled in the opposite direction, and lost her coherence. The numerous princes, margraves, counts, prince-bishops, and free cities, constituting the so-called "estates" of the medieval feudal realm, had acquired a constantly increasing

<sup>1</sup> Of these seven electors three were ecclesiastical dignitaries and four were lay princes. The seven were the archbishops of Mainz, of Köln (Cologne), and of Trier (Treves), the king of Bohemia, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg, and the count palatine of the Rhine.



independence of the central power, and had reduced the emperor to a puppet<sup>1</sup>

The greatest interest attaching to Maximilian's reign is connected with the circumstance that under him the last serious attempt was made to remodel the antiquated machinery of the imperial government. In the latter half of the fifteenth century something like a wave of national enthusiasm had swept over Germany, and beginning with the Diet of Worms of 1495, a number of Diets met to discuss measures of reform. The result was a miserable disappointment; for what was done did not effect any substantial change in the position of the central authority, the emperor. Such reform as was carried out limited itself to the establishment of the greater internal security of the realm. The right of private warfare, the most insufferable survival of feudal times, was abolished, a perpetual peace proclaimed, and to support this peace there was instituted a special court of justice, the Imperial Chamber (Reichskammergericht), to which all conflicts between the estates of the realm had to be referred for amicable adjustment. This is the largest measure of reform which the local governments in control of the Diet would, out of jealousy of the central government, concede. The emperor was left as before without an income, without any administrative functions, and without an army. He was and remained, as long as the Holy Roman Empire continued to exist, a poor lay-figure, draped for merely scenic purposes in the mantle of royalty. If we hear of powerful emperors in the future (Charles V., for instance), we shall discover that they owed their power, never to the empire, but always to the force which they derived from their hereditary lands.

Maximilian, sometimes called the last knight, was a kind, generous man, who might have been spared the various mis-

<sup>1</sup> There were at this time about three hundred of these local governments, some, like Saxony and Brandenburg, large enough to be respectable, others as circumscribed as an American township. Germany was visibly verging toward a time when she would be decomposed, in fact and in law, into three hundred independent states.

fortunes of his life if he had not taken the empire and its threadbare splendours seriously. He tried to make good the ancient imperial claims to part of Italy, and naturally met with derision. he tried to unite Europe against the Turks, who had overrun the east (fall of Constantinople. 1453) and were moving westward up the Danube and along the Mediterranean, but he could not even influence his own Germans to a national war of defence. However, a number of matrimonial bargains richly compensated Maximilian for his many political disappointments. In the year 1477 he married Mary of Burgundy, the only child of Charles the Bold and the heiress of the Netherlands, and in 1496 his son Philip was united to Joan of Castile, heiress of Ferdinand and Isabella, first joint rulers of United Spain. Philip dying and Joan becoming insane, their son Charles was proclaimed, first, duke of Burgundy, and, later, on the death of Ferdinand (1516), king of Spain. Finally, when the emperor Maximilian died (1519), Charles fell heir also to Austria, and soon after was elected, in consequence of his great position, to succeed his grandfather in the empire. Thus Charles V. became, chiefly owing to the politic matches of Maximilian, the ~~greatest monarch~~ *The Hapsburg marriages. Charles V., the greatest monarch of Europe.* of his day

### *Italy*

Italy, at the end of the Middle Age, had fallen into even worse confusion than Germany, for the very semblance of national unity had been abandoned. There were upon the peninsula five leading states: the duchy of Milan, the republic of Venice, the republic of Florence, the states of the Church, and the kingdom of Naples. During the fifteenth century the five leading states had been constantly engaged in wars among themselves. These wars did no great harm until it occurred to the kings of Spain and France to turn the local divisions of Italy to their personal advantage. Spain, at the end of the fifteenth century, already possessed the islands of Sardinia and Sicily,

and its royal House was closely related to the ruling House of Naples. Through these connections Spain acquired an active interest in Italian affairs. France also became interested in Italian affairs, when upon the death of the last male representative of the House of Anjou (1481),<sup>1</sup> such rights as the House of Anjou possessed to Naples were transferred to the king of France. Charles VIII of France resolved on his accession to make good his claims upon Naples by force, and in 1494 he made his famous invasion of Italy. Spain being, of course, unable to permit without opposition the extension of France, there began in consequence that contest between the two rivals for the possession of Italy which lasted for over fifty years and ended in the complete victory of Spain. At the beginning of our period this result was not yet apparent. But within a few years after the outbreak of the French-Spanish wars, the states of Italy, overrun and plundered by superior forces, commenced to exhibit material alterations in their political status.

*Naples.*—If Naples, as it was the first, had remained the only source of quarrel between France and Spain, peace might soon have been re-established. For after having been traversed again and again by French and Spanish troops, the kingdom of Naples was definitely ceded by France to Spain (1504), of which it was destined to remain a part for two hundred years (till the Treaty of Utrecht, 1713). Unfortunately, a second bone of contention between the two great western monarchies was found in the duchy of Milan.

*Milan.*—The duchy of Milan was legally a fief of the Holy Roman Empire, but was held at this time in practically independent possession by the family of the Sforza. When Charles VIII of France died in 1498, Louis XII, his successor, remembered that he was a descendant of a family, the Visconti, who had ruled in Milan before the Sforza. On the strength of this vague priority, Louis resolved

<sup>1</sup> The House of Anjou was connected with the royal House of France, and had an old claim to the kingdom of Naples

to supplant the Sforza upstart Having invaded and conquered Milan in 1499, he held that city successfully until there was formed against him the Holy League, composed of the pope, Venice, Spain, and England (1512). The Holy League quickly succeeded in driving the French out of Italy and in reinstating the Sforza family in their duchy. Louis XII. died in 1515, without having reconquered Milan, but his successor, Francis I, immediately upon his accession, marched his army off to Italy to try in his turn the fortunes of war and conquest His brilliant victory of Marignano (1515) again put the French in possession of Milan. For a short time now there was peace between France and Spain, but naturally the Spaniards saw with envy the extension of French influence over the north of Italy, and when Charles, king of Spain, was elected emperor in 1519, the necessary pretext for renewing the war with France was given into his hands. It has already been said that Milan was legally a fief of the empire In his capacity of emperor, Charles could find a ready justification for interfering in the affairs of his dependency Immediately upon his election he resolved to challenge the right of the French to Milan, and so the French-Spanish wars in Italy were renewed.

*Venice.*—In the fifteenth century Venice was the strongest of all the Italian states She called herself a republic, but was more truly an oligarchy, the power lying in the hands of the nobles who composed the Great Council and elected the chief dignitary, the doge or duke The power of Venice was due to her immense trade and possessions in the Orient<sup>1</sup> In addition to these colonial territories she held the whole north-eastern portion of Italy The Renaissance is the period of the glory of Venice; at the beginning of the Modern Period that glory was already rapidly waning The first obstacle to the continued prosperity of Venice was the Turks. The Turks, having

<sup>1</sup> She held the Morea, Candia, Cyprus, and most of the islands of the Ægean and Ionian Seas.

begun their irresistible march through western Asia and eastern Europe, unsparingly wrenched from Venice, bit by bit, her oriental trade and possessions. The second misfortune which befell Venice was the discovery, by Vasco da Gama, of the sea passage to India around the Cape of Good Hope. This discovery, by drawing off the oriental commerce to Spain and Portugal, struck a fatal blow at Venetian prosperity. Thus decline set in, but nevertheless the republic continued to live in some fashion or other till Napoleon made an end of it in the year 1797.

*Florence* —The Republic of Florence, far-famed in the period of the Renaissance for its great artists and writers, had, in the fifteenth century, lost its free constitution, and fallen under the domination of a native family, the Medici (Lorenzo the Magnificent, the greatest of the line, ruled from 1469 to 1492). But in spite of the Medici the love for the republic remained enshrined in the hearts of the people. When, therefore, the invasion of Charles VIII (1494) offered a chance to cast off the Medicean yoke, the people rose, banished their tyrants, and re-established the republic. Girolamo Savonarola, a pious monk, who had, through his stirring invectives against the general corruption of manners, acquired a great following, became the popular hero and leader, and for four years controlled the government, and laboured at the reform of morals. During the period of Savonarola's supremacy, Florence presented to her astonished contemporaries, who dwelt upon the free heights of the pagan Renaissance, the picture of a narrow Biblical theocracy. But in 1498 Savonarola's enemies compassed his overthrow and burned him at the stake. For a few more years the republic went on as best it could, until in 1512 the Medici reconquered the city. In 1527 the Florentines made a last attempt to regain their liberties. Again they cast the Medici out, but again the banished princes returned, this time with the help of Charles V. (1529), who now honoured the head of the Medicean House, Alexander, by conferring upon him and his

heirs Florence and her territory under the name of the duchy (later the grand duchy) of Tuscany.

*The States of the Church*—During the period of the Renaissance, the popes, becoming pagan like the rest of the world, sacrificed every principle to the desire of being brilliant secular princes. Their dominant aspiration was to consolidate the territory of the Church. This territory, running across the middle of the peninsula, formed an extensive possession, but had fallen in large part into the hands of petty tyrants. Pope Alexander VI (1492–1503), of the family of Borgia, infamous for his murders and excesses, has the merit of having carried the papal policy to a successful issue. Through the unscrupulous agency of his son Cæsar Borgia, the petty tyrants of the papal states were either poisoned or assassinated. Thus at last the pope became master in the hereditary dominion of St Peter.

*The States  
of the  
Church ac-  
quire soli-  
darity.*

Alexander VI was followed by two popes, who, if they are not great spiritual lights, have nevertheless interesting personalities. They are Julius II (1503–13) and Leo X. (1513–21), the latter a member of the famous Florentine family of the Medici. Both of these popes will always be remembered for their splendid patronage of the arts<sup>1</sup>. It was during the papacy of Leo X., whose interests were literary, artistic, social, in short everything but religious, and whose nature and associations inclined him to a pagan conception of life, that there was raised in Germany the cry for reform which led to the Protestant schism.

*Savoy*.—In north-western Italy, on the border of France, lay among the Alps the duchy of Savoy. At the beginning of the Modern Period the duke of Savoy was not yet an influential power. But during the next centuries he grew stronger and stronger through perseverance and hardihood, until finally his power surpassed that of any other prince of Italy. In our own century the House of Savoy has become the royal house of united Italy.

<sup>1</sup> Church of St Peter begun; Michel Angelo and Raffaele at Rome.

*France*

Under Charles VII. (1422-61) and Louis XI. (1461-83) France had lost her old feudal character and become an absolute monarchy. The great dukes and counts had been forced into submission to the will of the king. The king had become master, he had secured himself a revenue over which he had free disposal (through a land-tax called *taille*), and he had created a standing army, which was at his and not at the nobles' orders. Louis XI. also added to France several outlying provinces, which were necessary to the completion of the nation. These were Provence in the south-east and the duchy of Burgundy in the east. When his son Charles VIII. (1483-98) acquired Brittany in the north-west, the process of the unification of France may be said to have been completed. Being now united within under the constitution of the absolute king, she was also strong to act against external foes. Under these circumstances Charles VIII. could afford to turn his thoughts to foreign conquest, and, burning with ambition, undertook to conquer Naples on the strength of certain inherited claims, and invaded Italy (1494). But his policy of foreign conquest incited the hostility of his jealous neighbour Spain, and led to the great French-Spanish wars for the possession of Italy, which lasted, with occasional interruptions, for fifty years. The review of Italy has acquainted us with the early stages of this conflict. Charles VIII., after a brief triumph, was forced to give up Naples. Finally it was ceded to Ferdinand of Spain (1504). Louis XII. of France (1498-1515) renewed the struggle in Italy by laying hold of the duchy of Milan, and though he was forced to give up Milan in 1512 (the Holy League), his successor, Francis I. (1515-47), immediately reconquered it by the victory of Marignano (1515).

*Spain*

The movement toward national unity and absolutism, just observed in France, is no less characteristic of the political development, during the fifteenth century, of Spain. The unity of Spain, after having made steady progress for some centuries, was finally secured by the marriage of Ferdinand (1479-1516) and Isabella (1474-1504), who were the heirs respectively of the two largest Christian kingdoms on the peninsula, Aragon and Castile. Both of these kingdoms had grown strong by championing the national cause against the Moors, who had, in the Middle Age, overrun the peninsula. In the year 1492, Granada, the last foothold of the Moors, was captured, and therewith the Mohammedan power in Spain, which had lasted for eight centuries, came to an end.

The unification of Spain inaugurated a period of territorial expansion which is unparalleled in history. In the same year in which the Moorish kingdom fell, Columbus discovered America, and opened up to Spain the vast dominion of the new world. Next Ferdinand, upon being drawn into war with France on account of the conquest of Naples by Charles VIII, succeeded in beating the French and seizing the kingdom of Naples for himself (1504). In 1512 he further acquired that part of the border-kingdom of Navarre which lay upon the Spanish slope of the Pyrenees. Thus it happened that when Ferdinand was succeeded upon his death by his grandson, Charles (1516-56), this young king found himself master of the most extensive territories of the world. Although Charles was, merely by virtue of his position as king of Spain, the leading sovereign of Europe, he had additional interests and resources as ruler of the Netherlands and archduke of Austria, which raised him far above any rival. Finally, in 1519, the electors of the empire made him emperor.



The growth of the royal power had meanwhile kept pace with the extension of Spain. Ferdinand and Isabella, with the aid of the cities, put down the robber knights, and thus secured the peace of the land. Then the monarchs turned their attention to the nobility. The feudal Parliament of Castile (called Cortes) was first restricted in its influence, and then robbed of all importance. The Parliament of Aragon held out a little longer against the royal encroachments. But the act which more than any other registered the extension of the central power was the introduction of the Inquisition for the persecution of heretics and of enemies of the government—that is, of Jews, Moors, and, later, Protestants. How severely this organisation interpreted its task is witnessed by the fact that during the reign of the first Grand Inquisitor, Thomas de Torquemada (1483–98), about 10,000 persons were burned alive, 6,000 burned in effigy, and 90,000 condemned to ecclesiastical and civil penalties.

### England

England passed in the fifteenth century through the great domestic crisis known as the War of the Roses. But the end came in 1485, when Richard III., the last king of the house of York, was defeated and killed at the battle of Bosworth. The victor, himself of the House of Tudor, but at the same time a descendant of the House of Lancaster, succeeded to the throne as Henry VII. (1485–1509). Through the marriage of Henry VII. to Elizabeth, a daughter of the House of York, the new House of Tudor united the claims of both contending houses, and thus the civil war came at length to an end.

Under Henry VII., an extremely cautious and politic man, there grew up in England the “strong Tudor monarchy.” Traditionally, the power in England lay in the hands of the king and the Parliament, composed of the two Houses of the Lords and the Commons. However, absolutism was in the air at the time, as

is witnessed by the cases of France and Spain. By following a consistent policy, Henry succeeded in making the English monarchy, too, almost absolute. He did this, first, by lessening the authority of the turbulent nobility. He forbade them to keep armed and liveried retainers, thus depriving them of their military power, and by means of the Star Chamber court of justice, dependent on himself, he kept watch over them and punished them for all infringements of the public law. Secondly, by raising money irregularly through fines and forced loans, he became independent of the regular taxes which the Parliament alone could vote, and thus was enabled to get along, to a large extent, without calling the Parliament together. Of Henry's various measures the result was the pacification of the realm. England would now have fallen as completely into the hands of her sovereign as France had done, if it had not been for that saving law upon her statute-books that the king could raise no taxes without the consent of Parliament. This provision neither Henry VII nor any of his successors dared abrogate, and in the course of time, when the common people had acquired wealth and dignity, it became the weapon by which the "strong monarchy" was struck to the ground and Parliament set in the monarch's place.